

1887. Also, petition of Ida M. Black and 28 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. Also, petition of Jessie Patrick and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1889. Also, petition of Olive M. Buttles and 17 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1890. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Pearl Danner and 19 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. Also, petition of Hazel J. Reed and 28 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. Also, petition of H. C. Barrigan and 15 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1893. Also, petition of R. J. Carlson and 32 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1894. Also, petition of Robert Lincoln Kelley and 35 other residents of Waterville, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1895. Also, petition of Nona Andre and 23 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1896. Also, petition of R. D. Bishop and 17 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1897. Also, petition of Jessie M. Snodgrass and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1898. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Herr and 33 other residents of Pateros, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1899. Also, petition of Virginia Layton and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. Also, petition of Effie M. Johnson and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1901. Also, petition of Selma Hitchen and 37 other residents of Spokane, requesting Congress to stop the sale of intoxicating drinks in Army camps and around them; and to make provision to clean up adjacent cities, if the constituted authorities do not, thus keeping temptation from our men and boys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, on the birthday of national independence we confess our dependence upon Thee. Without Thee we are lost in spite of the overwhelming might of our material arms.

We thank Thee for those pilgrims of faith who came hither in their frail barque across mountainous seas and who stepped upon strange shores with the salutation to a new world, "In the name of God. Amen." The Nation here established, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal has acknowledged that Name above every name and revered it, has built its altars, reared its temples, and raised its steeples, emblems of a faith that points to the skies and wings its sure and certain way to God. Make that faith of the fathers, we pray, real to us in these tempestuous days. Save us from a freedom of speech so empty that we have nothing worth saying, from a freedom of worship so futile that we have no God to adore, from freedom from want

and fear with no creative idea as to how to use our plenty or our security for the redemption of our social order and for the salvation of our own souls. Let all that is low and unworthy in us sink to the depths. Let all that is high and fine in us rise to greet the morn of a new day confident that the best is yet to be. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Saturday, July 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 1, 1943:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

On July 3, 1943:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, and 32 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school

students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and it was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

#### AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99, relating to Federal crop insurance, to the agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 2481.

Under the order of the Senate of Saturday last, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

The Chair also calls attention to the fact that a vote shall be taken on the motion of the Senator from Georgia at not later than 1 o'clock p. m. today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I presume the Senator from Alabama is about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. I am about to make the suggestion that no quorum is present.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as a vote is to be taken at 1 o'clock, I doubt if there will be much time left after a quorum is secured.

Mr. REED. Let me say for the RECORD that the crop-insurance program is one of the relatively unimportant things I intend to discuss this morning. I propose to discuss the whole wheat situation and its relation to food and feed for next year, and I certainly desire more Senators in the Chamber than are now present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Downey
Austin	Capper	Ellender
Barkley	Caraway	Ferguson
Bone	Chavez	George
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	Gerry
Brooks	Connally	Guffey
Burton	Danaher	Gurney
Butler	Davis	Hawkes

Hayden	Murdock	Taft
Hill	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Holman	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Kilgore	Overton	Tydings
La Follette	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
Langer	Reed	Van Nuys
McCarran	Revercomb	Wagner
McClellan	Reynolds	Wallgren
McFarland	Robertson	Walsh
McKellar	Russell	Wheeler
Maloney	Scrugham	Wherry
Maybank	Shipstead	White
Millikin	Smith	Wiley
Moore	Stewart	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILEO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I request that my colleagues not ask me to yield for any purpose, and I make the request solely because of the limitation on my time due to the agreement to vote at 1 o'clock.

I wish to say to the Senate also that while crop insurance is important, it is relatively unimportant in the light of the various phases of the wheat and feed and food situation which I shall develop. If in the course of my remarks it should seem that I do not know as much as I should know about the work of the conferees, nothing I say is to be taken as critical of their candor and good faith. If there is any lack of knowledge on my part, it is probably my own fault. But the situation which has developed has been startling to me.

Wheat will be harvested in 1943 from approximately 52,000,000 acres. It is part of the announced program of the

War Foods Administration, first indicated by Chester C. Davis, to ask wheat farmers to harvest 70,000,000 acres in 1944, which is an addition of 18,000,000 acres. It is broadly indicated that of the increase in acreage, 10,000,000 are to be planted in the Hard Winter Wheat Belt, embracing the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado, Panhandle of Texas; 5,000,000 acres in the Hard Spring-wheat area, covering the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; and the other 3,000,000 acres in the Soft Winter wheat area in Missouri and east of the Mississippi River, together with some increased acreage in Washington and Oregon.

In order to provide the wheat farmers with an incentive to plant the increased acreage, the following steps are being taken:

First. The latest figures available, June 15, 1943, show that the farm price of wheat is \$1.24. Parity price for wheat is \$1.45 a bushel. The wheat farmer is receiving 21 cents less than parity. While there is no ceiling price on wheat, the price of wheat is held down by ceilings on flour and bread prices. These ceilings have been fixed by the O. P. A. in direct violation of the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942. It is the intention of the O. P. A. to continue to hold down the price of wheat. This is encouragement No. 1 to the wheat farmer to increase his acreage.

Second. Under the appropriation bill as written by the House and insisted upon by the House conferees, the wheat farmer is to be deprived of any participation in the crop benefits under the Soil Conservation Act. This is encouragement No. 2, and takes 9 cents a bushel from the wheat farmer for next year as compared with this year.

Third. Notwithstanding the fact that wheat is now 21 cents below parity, the House left out provision for parity payments. The Senate Committee on Appropriations inserted the provision and then receded. This is encouragement No. 3.

Fourth. The House insists upon outlawing the wheat-crop-insurance program.

This program was established by an act of Congress in 1938. Beginning in 1939 and continuing to 1942, wheat-insurance contracts were written on a 1-year basis. The results were not satisfactory and in 1942, 3-year term contracts were made. Four hundred and eighty-seven thousand 3-year term wheat contracts were written in 1942 by important wheat-producing States. They are:

	Insured farms
Nebraska	67,074
Kansas	42,165
Ohio	40,862
Michigan	32,253
Indiana	32,022
Missouri	30,016
Illinois	29,601
Oklahoma	22,975
Minnesota	20,747
North Dakota	13,800
Texas	9,785
South Dakota	9,553
Pennsylvania	7,086
Colorado	4,138
Maryland	2,448



It is now proposed that the Federal Government walk out on the 487,000 farmers who hold these contracts. The House is insisting upon liquidating the crop-insurance program as of July 31, 1943—this month.

If all these policies are followed, there is no chance to secure the increased acreage of wheat desired for both food and feed. From the additional 18,000,000 acres, if planted and harvested, it would be expected to obtain upward of 200,000,000 bushels, in addition to the crop from the normal acreage. This increase is the largest asked of any important class of farmers contributing to the war effort.

The agricultural appropriation bill, as passed by the House, was a lame affair. The Senate Appropriations Committee so amended it as to make a better bill. The House conferees are now insisting upon tearing it to pieces so far as the wheat farmer is concerned.

I have no intention of agreeing that the wheat farmer shall be forced to play the role of Czechoslovakia in a Munich appeasement conference in order to satisfy the prejudices of some of the House conferees. This is an attempt at legislative dictatorship, in violation of all the rules of legislative fair play. Twice the Senate overwhelmingly insisted, by a yeand-nay vote, upon retaining the crop-insurance program.

I do not want to place too much stress upon the wheat-crop-insurance phase of the situation. It is important, but not the only important element. In fact, I doubt if it is immediately the most important item in the situation. The holding of the price of wheat below parity, which is being done, and which the O. P. A. intends to continue to do, is the most discouraging feature. The only point I make about the crop-insurance factor is that it can easily qualify as the last straw laid upon the wheat farmer, which broke his back.

The House threatens failure of the appropriation bill unless the Senate recedes. So far as the Senate is concerned, I shall ask that the bill be returned to the House with the Senate amendment, and let the House bear the entire responsibility of failure with respect to the bill if it should fail. That is where the responsibility belongs.

Mr. President, I shall now summarize the present wheat situation, and the action of the Congress. I have caused a brief statement to be prepared and distributed on the desks of my colleagues. I hope they may follow me, because the question under discussion is one of the most important to come before the Senate.

Let us review briefly what Congress had done to the wheat grower, in face of the fact that his Government is going to ask him to plant from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 more acres to wheat this fall and next spring.

Of all the major staple crops, wheat alone now is selling below parity.

Through ceilings on flour and bread, the administration has served notice on the wheat grower that the price of wheat is to be held around 85 percent of parity.

There has been written into the appropriation bill a prohibition against any

parity payments on the wheat crop to be harvested in 1944. The bill now prohibits any crop payments being made on wheat harvested in 1944. These two payments this year would amount to 23 cents a bushel.

In other words, Congress has notified the wheat grower that he is to receive 23 cents a bushel less for his 1944 wheat than he would receive under the A. A. A. and appropriations made under it for the crop harvested in 1943. So Congress is penalizing the wheat grower 23 cents a bushel for growing wheat, while at the same time asking him to grow more wheat.

That already has been done.

Now it is proposed, by the motion offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that Congress shall also take from 487,000 wheat growers the crop insurance for which they had signed up during the past year, under what they understood was a 3-year insurance contract.

Judging from past experience, and from statistics as to the amount of land that can be put into wheat, the bulk of the fifteen to twenty million increase in wheat acreage must be planted in the Great Plains area, five or more million acres in my own State of Kansas.

This is the high risk wheat-growing area of the United States. Any farmer who plants wheat in this area knows that he faces the prospect of not getting a crop.

The wheat grower has been getting some measure of protection in past years. If he were in compliance, he knew he would get 9 cents a bushel on his average yield on his acreage allotment, in the form of a crop payment. That has been taken away from him.

He was entitled to about 14 cents a bushel in the form of parity payments, if wheat remained at 85 percent of parity or less. That has already been taken away from him.

He could take crop insurance, by paying premiums based on the record of his farm, up to 75 percent of his normal crop yields. It is proposed to take that away from him.

And through price ceilings on wheat products Congress threatens him that under no conditions shall he receive more than 85 percent of parity for what crop he does raise. Certainly he will receive no higher price if the present Government policies are carried out.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the consuming States that their supply of this most important of all foods for next year is threatened. Instead of from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres more under these conditions, the production is likely to be less. Wheat represents one of the most serious problems facing the people of the country, and I challenge the attention of the consuming States as well as the wheat-producing States to the possibilities contained in the situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to second everything the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has said. If there is anything about which I

know it is the production of wheat. That was my grandfather's business, it was my father's business, and it has been almost the major part of my business in the Northwest.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that in the last World War the farmer received \$2.26 a bushel for his wheat at Minneapolis. Today, at Stanley, N. Dak., the farmers are receiving \$1.17 a bushel. One of the reasons why the farmers in North Dakota are raising wheat is because during the last 2 years they have had exceptionally large crops. If normal conditions return, instead of having bumper crops such as were had last year, when the farmers had practically 2 years' crops in one because of the large yield per acre, what will happen? As the Senator from Kansas has said, all the safeguards and inducements the farmers had to raise wheat have been taken away from them during the last few months. The result is that the farmers will try to raise something else. They will raise more corn. Corn can be raised in the Northwest at much less cost per acre than wheat. It does not cost as much to produce the corn. Of course, corn will be fed to the livestock. The farmers can get their land in better shape if they raise corn, instead of wheat. Less labor is required to raise corn, rather than wheat.

However, that is not all. The farmers in the Northwest will raise more barley and oats. Now there is an incentive for them to raise flax; the farmers are offered a premium to raise it. The farmers will raise more soybeans and will put more land into the production of sugarbeets. The result will be that the country will suffer from lack of wheat.

The farmers in that section are equipped with the machinery with which to raise wheat. Yet, by taking away the incentives, by not giving the wheat farmers the kind of deal that is given to those who raise other crops, the result will simply be that millions of acres of land that formerly have been planted in wheat will not now be planted in wheat. There will be a decrease rather than an additional 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 acres planted in wheat, as the Department of Agriculture and other governmental departments are requesting at the present time.

I call attention to the further fact that, although some Senators may think the farmers can obtain loans on their wheat, from personal experience I know that frequently a farmer can borrow on only approximately half of his wheat, because of spoilage caused by the labor shortage. In the past year in my State much of the wheat that the farmers had in shocks in the fields was soaked with rain. A great many times as the combines have gone through the fields they have left the crop in windrows. The result was that when the rains came the grain that was on the field in windrows was beaten down into the ground, and when the pickups of the combines came along again they missed a part of it. A great deal of the wheat sprouted in the windrows and in the shocks them-

selves; and I know that in the eastern part of the State, for instance, in Ransom County, farmers lost about 25 cents a bushel.

In addition, such wheat contains an exceptionally large amount of moisture. If the moisture content is even one-eighth of 1 percent above the amount allowed under Government regulations, the result is that when the farmer stores his wheat he is unable to get a loan on it, and he has to have the wheat in storage on his farm moved in order to keep it from heating.

The result is that after the farmers have had several years' experience of that sort and have found that they are unable to obtain the loan value on their wheat, they will raise some crop that does not entail so much risk.

Another element enters into the picture. No one knows better than does the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who now is in the Chamber, that when the drought occurred in 1933, the first year I was Governor of the State of North Dakota, for a distance of 726 miles along the Great Northern Railroad, through North Dakota and Montana, not one carload of wheat was shipped. There was a total drought. Much the same situation existed in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937. In 1938 we had a fair crop. However, the wheat farmers stuck it out on the farms, relying upon the Federal Government. They did not move away to cities or to vastly congested areas, but they stayed there, relying upon being able to secure all the various kinds of assistance that the distinguished Senator from Kansas has just told us is now being taken away from them. They relied upon having those aids kept in full force and effect.

That is not all. The average small farmer has been able to go to his bank and say to the banker, "I need a little money to get my crop through," and the banker would lend him the money. However, under present conditions, if we take away crop insurance, the banker will not have as much inducement to lend money to the farmer. Formerly the banker would ask the farmer, "Are you covered by insurance?" If the farmer said he was, the banker knew he could lend him money, because he knew if hail or rust occurred, the farmer would have some insurance, so that he would be able to repay at least a part, if not all, the loan.

If crop insurance is discontinued, if the motion of the Senator from Georgia prevails, if the conference report is not sent back to conference, the result will be that the small farmers will likely not be able to borrow money from the banks, as mortgaging on the crop itself is forbidden by law in some States. In North Dakota, because there we have a State hail insurance system operated by the State of North Dakota itself, the farmers will be able to obtain hail insurance without paying very large premiums to the private hail insurance companies.

I call attention to the fact that in my State, for example, the people have time and again overwhelmingly voted in favor of State-owned hail insurance operations because they knew that under

such a system the premiums they would have to pay would be approximately one-third the amount of the premiums they would otherwise have to pay to private hail insurance companies.

A Senator came to me the other day and said that crop insurance was "socialistic." I called his attention to the fact that when the crop insurance law was adopted by Congress not a single company was engaged in that business. Years ago, in 1917, 1918, and 1919, there was a company in Pittsburgh, Pa., that wrote insurance covering the same causes of crop loss which are covered by the Federal Government. That company went broke; and in the States of North Dakota and Montana many claims were brought against that Pittsburgh company to make it pay for the losses. They quit business after the lawsuits were brought. All through the 1920's there was no place in the entire United States where the farmer could go and get insurance against drought, rust, grasshoppers, frost, or excessive heat. For the first time in the history of America the United States Government stepped in and helped the small farmers who had to have protection.

I can readily understand how some wealthy operator who plants thousands of acres of crops, and who is rich enough to take a loss 1 year can practically carry his own insurance, would not be affected by the elimination of crop insurance. However, if Federal crop insurance on wheat is taken away, the net result will be that small farmers all over the great Northwest will not take the risk. They will find some other crop to seed. If they cannot do that, they will let part of their land lie idle. The result will be a tremendous shortage of food.

I am very sorry that the various measures which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has mentioned will apparently be in effect unless this conference report is rejected. I do not know of anything that can be done about this terribly outrageous situation, unless we now refuse to agree to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and again send this question back to conference.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only has the House refused to permit crop insurance, but, as the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, it has eliminated the parity payments. In addition, the O. P. A. is holding down the price of wheat by a ceiling on the price of flour. So in 1944 the farmer cannot expect to receive more than about 85 cents a bushel for his wheat. The result will be either one of two things. Under the Price Control Act the Government will have to let the price of wheat go to parity, and if it lets it go to parity, the price of wheat will rise to about \$1.45. The only reason it has not been permitted to go to parity, and the subterfuge which has been used to keep it below that price is that it is said that we are allowing the farmers parity payments, and that parity payments ought to be taken into considera-

tion. So the price of wheat has been kept down. If the parity payments are taken away, there is no excuse whatever for preventing the price of wheat going to parity. I do not know how, under the law, the Government can prevent it.

If the price of wheat were allowed to go to parity, I would not complain particularly about repealing the parity payments; but what I am afraid of is that the farmer will not receive the parity price, and that the price ceiling on flour will be maintained, which will keep the price of wheat down around 85 cents. If that is done, we can rest assured that there will not be the increased production of wheat which the administration says we must have, not only during the war, but as a backlog to feed the world after the war is over.

We hear much said about policing and feeding the world. We had better give our attention to what is likely to happen in the United States and to the problem of feeding and policing the people of the United States when we become short of food when the farmers are not paid a sufficiently high price for wheat and other products to justify raising them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we cannot solve the problem by letting the price of wheat go to parity. As the Senator knows, there are thousands of small farmers in the Northwest. Unless they can have crop insurance, where are they to obtain the funds?

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator says about crop insurance. I am told that only about 3,000 farmers in Montana have received the benefit of it. I am speaking of something of far greater importance than crop insurance. I agree with the Senator that crop insurance should be provided. I do not object if some private company wishes to write it; but no private company will take the chance. The only agency which can do so is the Government.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] called attention to the point which I particularly wish to emphasize. I think many Members of the Senate have overlooked it. On the one hand, there is a ceiling on the price of flour. On the other hand, the parity payments are being repealed. The Government will have to do one of two things. Either it must allow the price of wheat to go to parity, which is about \$1.45, or it must give subsidies to the farmers by some scheme of which we know nothing at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will remember that about 2 months ago we were discussing the question of wheat. At that time we had before us the index price on farm machinery. I ask the Senator to recollect if it is not true that during the last World War the prices of farm machinery rose to their greatest height, and since that time, up to the present time, they have never gone down. The farmer who today buys farm machinery is paying more for it than he paid during the last war; and instead of receiving \$2.26 in Minneapolis for his



wheat, he is receiving \$1.17 at Stanley, N. Dak.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe the Senator probably is correct. I have not the figures as to farm machinery; but I know that during the depression, when the farmer could not obtain an adequate price for wheat, the prices of farm machinery did not go down to a degree comparable with the reduction in the price of wheat. The prices of farm machinery have remained high, because of the fact that the manufacturers of farm machinery can keep the prices up by closing the factories during a depression, when there is little demand for farm machinery and the farmers cannot buy it. However, there is nothing to keep the price of wheat up.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not wish to cut the Senator short, but I promised to yield to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who also wishes to discuss the question of crop insurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the agreement the Senate must vote at 1 o'clock. So far the only time that has been used has been taken by Senators who oppose the motion of the Senator from Georgia. If the Senator from North Dakota has concluded, he cannot yield time to another Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I have taken my 15 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes. I voted against this motion the other day. If the situation were normal, I would do so again. However, the situation is now such that the House conferees, I am informed, will not even go back into conference on this question. I understand that the House will not even consider a continuing resolution making appropriations available for the Department of Agriculture. That is an arbitrary and unreasonable attitude to take, but there is nothing we can do about it. If this bill is not passed, the result will be an entirely new appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, which might be, and probably would be, worse than this one. In view of that situation, I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I have always been in favor of crop insurance. I helped to enact the original law, and I have been for it ever since. I am for it now. However, as Grover Cleveland once said, we are confronted with a condition, and not a theory. The condition does not exist solely in this Chamber.

For the reasons which I have explained, I shall vote to recede from the Senate position. It seems to me that that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that he is no stronger a believer in crop insurance than I. As I have heretofore pointed out, the House voted on this question on five separate occasions, and the position of the Senate has lost ground on each vote. Finally, it was impossible for the supporters of crop insurance to rally one-fifth of the House membership

so as to enable the small guard still supporting crop insurance to obtain a record vote in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. The Senator from Georgia has been a valiant soldier in behalf of crop insurance. He is just as strong a supporter of crop insurance as I am. However, in the face of the existing situation, for which we are not responsible, it seems to me that the only thing we can do, in order not to risk making the situation even worse, is to agree to the Senator's motion.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Congress has gone far enough—in fact has already gone too far—in its attempts to punish the farmer for producing the food which is so badly needed in order to win this war and insure the peace.

Under directives, orders, and regulations from the O. P. A. the cattle raisers, the dairymen, and the poultry raisers are being steadily driven out of business, just at the time when more meat, more milk, more chickens, and more eggs are needed.

We are told, and in fact we know positively, that our people must shift from a meat diet to a cereal diet. That means that we shall need wheat and still more wheat. The War Food Administration knows this. Notice was served by Chester C. Davis, before he was forced to resign, that the wheat acreage must be increased this fall and next spring by some sixteen or eighteen million acres.

In the face of this need for more wheat acreage and more wheat, what has the Congress done to date to encourage wheat production? I list some of the actions taken to discourage wheat planting, while calling upon farmers as a patriotic duty to plant more wheat.

First. After Congress several times enacted into law the declaration that the wheat grower is entitled to parity price for wheat, it allowed the O. P. A. to fix price ceilings on flour, which means that the price of wheat is to be held at around 85 percent of parity.

Second. The Congress, in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year, has taken away from the wheat grower the agricultural crop payments which he has been allowed in past years, and to which he plainly is entitled under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Third. The Congress, in the same appropriation bill, has taken away the parity payments to which the wheat grower plainly is entitled under the law.

The effect of refusing appropriations or authorizations for these payments is to penalize the wheat grower around 23 cents a bushel, in the face of the fact that O. P. A. will not allow him to obtain the 23 cents a bushel in the market place.

Fourth. Now this Congress is proposing, through the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to cancel some 487,000 wheat crop-insurance contracts which still have 2 years to run, and to prevent the writing of any more insurance contracts on the additional sixteen or eighteen million acres of wheat desired to be planted. This in spite of the fact that the law providing for wheat crop insurance remains in effect.

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate, as well as by

Senators off the floor, to the effect that certain agencies of the Federal Government have not followed the law in their operations. What is it that the Senate is now asked to do by the Senator from Georgia, if not to ignore the wheat crop-insurance law? That law says that the wheat growers are entitled to crop insurance. The pending motion would take that insurance away from them, not through repealing the act, but by sneaking out the back door and taking away appropriations for administering the act.

The Congress has seen the executive branch of the Government manhandle the corn situation so badly that producers of chickens, cattle, and hogs are unable to obtain corn with which to feed their animals and fowls.

I ask, Does the the Congress want to create a similar situation in regard to wheat? In my judgment, the Senate certainly is on the way toward creating just that kind of a situation in regard to wheat. I sincerely trust that the motion will be voted down, and by a strong enough vote to require the crop-insurance amendments to be taken to a yeand-nay vote in the House, where I hope by this time there is a better understanding of the situation.

#### CATTLE INDUSTRY THREATENED WITH BANKRUPTCY

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram I have just received from W. K. Waugh and J. Y. Waugh, well-known cattlemen of Eskridge, Kans. It is very brief, and reads as follows:

Unless some sane solution adopted on beef situation at once, am afraid entire cattle industry will be bankrupt this fall.

This is a good time for the Senate to use calm judgment on all matters affecting food production, and put a stop to this punishment of farmers.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, I am supporting the motion of the Senator from Georgia to recede, because if we prolong this consideration and accomplish finally a complete disagreement and the inauguration of new legislation to sustain the Department of Agriculture, the Senate may well find itself losing some of the exceedingly important advantages which have been accomplished for the farmer in the pending agricultural appropriation bill.

I should not support the motion were it not for the fact that I stand thoroughly convinced that we cannot possibly again get the subject of crop insurance fairly before the House of Representatives. To do anything other than to recede would be to engage in the most hopeless kind of an enterprise. I say this, agreeing thoroughly, as I do, with what my colleague the Senator from Kansas has had to say about the dire problem which the wheat farmer faces at this time.

Mr. President, the House has again declined to permit the crop-insurance item to be dealt with fairly in that body. There is just one answer to the House of Representatives, as I see it, and I shall take advantage of the situation which will present itself later in the day when

we shall have to deal with the final deficiency bill. When that bill is presented I shall offer an amendment to the deficiency bill repealing the action which I presume the Congress will have taken by that time on crop insurance, writing into the deficiency bill the appropriations necessary to continue the crop-insurance administration. I shall do this with the anticipation that there will be no way by which the House of Representatives can escape a clean-cut facing of the issue.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there has been no firmer supporter of the effort to work out the problem of insuring crops of the farmers of this country than I. In my opinion, it holds great promise, and I feel that it is a tragedy that it should be stricken down at this time. However, because of the substantial and material gains in behalf of the farmers generally, which were made by the Senate in conference over the House bill, I feel that it would be a great mistake for us at this time to carry on a futile fight for this amendment. I believe it would be futile because the House has now reached the point where it declines even to grant our request for a conference.

I desired to make this brief statement in order that there could be no misunderstanding of my vote in favor of the motion offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last Saturday afternoon I stated, for reasons which I assigned at that time, that in my opinion the Senate had a great deal to lose and nothing to gain by further insisting on the crop-insurance provision in the pending bill. I shall gladly support the amendment which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] proposes to offer.

I wish to point out to Senators who might have been disturbed by the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] that there was a slight error in the Senator's statement. In the first place, the statement was made that the farmers still have the guaranty of 90 percent of parity on loans. I was under the impression that in legislation enacted last year we had raised the loan value to 90 percent of parity.

In addition, Mr. President, under the price Control Act, as I understand it, if the English language means anything, no price level may be put on any commodity processed in whole or in part from agricultural commodities which would defeat parity in the market place. The wheat farmer is in no different category from the cotton farmer, the corn farmer, the tobacco farmer, or the rice farmer with respect to next year's program. Under the program carried in the bill for next year, none of the acreage allotment payments will be made to any farmer. So there has been no discrimination against the wheat farmer in that respect. Mr. President, I believe it would be the part of wisdom for the Senate to recede on this item. I make that statement as one who believes that crop insurance has not had a fair trial and as one who would like to see the program continued. I hope it can be done in some other bill.

LXXXIX—451

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, further debate on the pending motion is precluded. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill making appropriations for the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scruggam
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Van Nuys
Danaher	Moore	Wagner
Davis	Murdock	Wallgren
Downey	Nye	Walsh
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wherry
George	Overton	White
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wiley
Guffey	Reed	Willis
Gurney	Revercomb	
Hawkes		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question before the Senate is on receding from the Senate amendment making provision for crop insurance, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the motion of the Senator from Georgia. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And that is the question on which the Senate is now voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, if a Senator favors crop insurance, his vote should be "nay"—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the debate on this issue had closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call is in progress, and debate is not in order. The clerk will resume calling the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 23, as follows:

## YEAS—44

Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bone	Hayden	Reynolds
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Scruggam
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Caraway	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McFarland	Tydings
Danaher	McKellar	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
Ellender	Nye	Wallgren
George	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Gerry	Overton	White
Gurney	Radcliffe	

## NAYS—23

Aiken	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Murdock	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	Wiley
Guffey	Robertson	Willis
Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead	

## NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Barbour	Chandler
Austin	Bilbo	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Brewster	Eastland
Ball	Buck	Gillette
Bankhead	Bushfield	Glass



Green	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Hatch	Mead	Tobey
Johnson, Calif.	Moore	Truman
Lodge	Murray	Wilson
Lucas	Pepper	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.  
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

**SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 92)**

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$800,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION AND OFFICE OF BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL (S. Doc. No. 93)**

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior and Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$1,100,000 and \$65,000, respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

**SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS**

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 163 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under statutory authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

**CLERICAL ASSISTANCE AT POST OFFICES**

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches or stations serving military and Navy personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

**PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

Letters from various departments and agencies, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Executive Office (Executive Mansion and Grounds);  
Office of Defense Transportation;  
National War Labor Board;  
United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration;  
Board of Investigation and Research (Transportation Act of 1940);  
Smaller War Plants Corporation;  
Smithsonian Institution (and National Gallery of Art); and  
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

**PETITIONS**

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Eugene E. Norton and sundry other citizens of Gorham, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Marion, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

**RESOLUTIONS FROM AKRON, OHIO—  
DECORATIONS FOR MOTHERS WHOSE  
SONS MAKE THE SUPREME SACRIFICE**

Mr. BURTON presented resolutions adopted by members of the American Slovak Political Club and Aerie No. 55, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, both of Akron, Ohio, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide, through legislative action, for a suitable decoration to be awarded free to the mothers of all those in the armed forces who make the supreme sacrifice for their country

Whereas there is now no provision for a congressional decoration to be awarded to those mothers of America whose sons make the supreme sacrifice for their country; and

Whereas the members of the American Slovak Political Club of Akron, Ohio, feel that provision should be made by Congress to issue a suitable decoration and to award the same free to all such mothers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the American Slovak Political Club of Akron, Ohio:*

SECTION I. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to provide for the issuance of a suitable decoration and the means whereby the same may be awarded free to the mothers of this country whose sons make the supreme sacrifice.

SEC. II. That the secretary of said American Slovak Political Club, of Akron, Ohio, be and the same is authorized to certify copies of this resolution to the Honorable Ed ROWE, Congressman from the Fourteenth District; Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, our Ohio Senators; the Akron Beacon-Journal, and the Summit County Democrat.

ANDY JAROS, President.  
JOHN JAVORNIK, Secretary.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide through legislative action, for a suitable decoration to be awarded free to the mothers of all those in the armed forces who make the supreme sacrifice for their country

Whereas there is now no provision for a congressional decoration to be awarded to those mothers of America whose sons make the supreme sacrifice for their country; and

Whereas the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Akron Aerie No. 555, of Akron, Ohio, feel that provision should be made by Congress to issue a suitable decoration and to award the same free to all such mothers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by Akron Aerie No. 555, the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Akron, Ohio:*

SECTION I. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to provide for the issuance of a suitable decoration and the means whereby the same may be awarded free to the mothers of this country whose sons make the supreme sacrifice.

SEC. II. That the secretary of said Fraternal Order of Eagles, Akron Aerie No. 555, be and the same is authorized and directed to certify copies of this resolution to the Honorable Ed ROWE, Congressman from the Fourteenth District; Senator ROBERT A. TAFT

and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, our Ohio Senators; the Eagle Magazine; and M. L. Brown, secretary of the Ohio State Aerie.

JOHN PODA, Chairman.  
HOWARD A. KIRBY, President.  
ROBERT H. MAXON, Secretary.

**RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF NORWALK,  
CONN.—RATIONING OF GASOLINE**

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have a letter under date of July 3 from Honorable Le Roy D. Downs, a former Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut, now comptroller of the city of Norwalk, Conn., reporting that on July 2 there was a largely attended mass meeting of citizens of Norwalk who adopted a resolution. I ask that the resolution appear in the RECORD in full at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the citizens of Norwalk, in a meeting assembled, protest against the ban on driving to local beaches. We believe in gas rationing; but when we have been sold the amount of gas to which we are entitled under our A card allotment, then we should be permitted to use this gas for the healthful purpose of driving to our local beaches and waters; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this protest be sent to: Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss Brown, Fuel Administrator Harold Ickes, State Office of Price Administration Director Chester Bowles, Senators Francis T. Maloney and John A. Danaher, and Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce.

**ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION  
OF FEDERAL OFFICERS**

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have, under date of July 2, a letter from the Connecticut Conference on Social and Labor Legislation, of New Haven, attaching an open letter addressed to my colleague and to me, bearing the signatures of many who have subscribed to the sentiments expressed in the open letter.

I ask unanimous consent that both the letter of transmittal and the open letter, with the names signatory thereto, be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, as follows:

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE ON  
SOCIAL AND LABOR LEGISLATION,  
New Haven, Conn., July 2, 1943.  
Senator JOHN A. DANAHER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: I enclose herewith an open letter addressed to you and Senator MALONEY, signed by approximately 235 leading citizens of Connecticut.

We trust that you will use your influence as member of the Judiciary Committee to bring this poll-tax bill, H. R. 7, to the floor of the Senate. We would like this action in the next few days if possible.

Signatures for this letter are still coming in; but due to the need for immediate action, we are forwarding those received to date.

Yours truly,

ETHEL H. FAUST,  
Acting Secretary.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SENATORS FROM  
CONNECTICUT

DEAR SENATORS DANAHAY AND MALONEY: The poll tax, which is levied in seven Southern States as a prerequisite for voting, is an unqualified evil. It places an unjust barrier between millions of Negro and white citizens and the voting booth. It is a direct curtailment of democratic rights and, as such, must be abhorrent to us at all times. But this is doubly so in time of war when the Nation's struggle against fascism and nazi-ism needs the maximum devotion and initiative of all the people.

The Connecticut Conference on Social and Labor Legislation has for many years campaigned for poll-tax repeal. We have noted with joy that in the Seventy-eighth Congress the House of Representatives has already voted by 265 to 110 to abolish the poll tax. We believe it is greatly to the credit of our State that all six Connecticut Representatives voted for House Resolution No. 7.

This matter now rests with the Senate. We are not unmindful that last year when the shocking filibuster against this legislation developed in the Senate you voted for the motion to limit debate.

This year there are already indications that another filibuster is contemplated. It is our deepest belief that, in the interests of American democracy in time of war, nothing must be allowed to prevent passage of this legislation.

We wish to urge upon you to use your great influence both with the Judiciary Committee and with the Senate as a whole to insure passage of the bill without delay. We feel that extended hearings in the Senate are unnecessary since the bill is, we understand, substantially identical with the one presented last year. We ask you to aid, to the utmost of your ability, in giving leadership to this nonpartisan and absolutely vital campaign. We know that your influence is great; and we, therefore, express our hope that your attitude in this matter will not be one of acquiescence but of active leadership.

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE ON  
SOCIAL AND LABOR LEGISLATION,  
New Haven, Conn.SIGNERS OF OPEN LETTER TO CONNECTICUT SENATORS  
FOR THE REPEAL OF THE POLL TAX: TO  
JULY 2, 1943

Andover: Mrs. John F. Phelps, teacher; David Yeomano, audit engineer, State Capitol. Ansonia: Francis J. Bolland; Rev. Salvatore Lo Presti. Bridgeport: Mrs. Minnie Cederholm, job discrimination conference; Leigh Danenberg, publisher, Bridgeport Herald; Oliver L. Arsenault, president, and Frank Fazekas, business agent, Local 203, U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.); Leon Fleischer; Rev. Fred Hoskins; Frank Kennell, teacher; Ruth Kennell; Edyth Lively; Henry J. McAden; Rev. Robert Peters; Raymond Riggs; Rev. William Sullivan; Attorney Arthur B. Weiss; Rev. Ronald Wells. Bridgewater: George D. Pratt, dairy farmer. Bristol: Albert DeCapua, president, U. E. R. M. W. A., No. 260. Brookfield: William McFee, writer. Chaplin: Rev. Walter E. Lanphear; Rev. F. Waldo Savage. Cobalt: Luva M. Mead, teacher; Mrs. C. Weaver Squires. Colchester: Julia H. Bartman, principal, Bacon Academy. Columbia: Mrs. Joseph W. Waterson. Danbury: Rev. Harry Adams Hersey; Rabbi Jerome R. Malino. Danielson: Rev. Henry A. Coolidge; Rev. Harold E. Crow. Darien: Marguerite Tjader Harris, editor, Direction magazine; Mrs. Paul J. Soley. Ellington: Hyman Pashell. Fairfield: Mrs. Elizabeth T. Cuffee. Gaylordsville: Peter Blume; Matthew Josephson, historian; Rev. Charles W. Simpson. Greenwich: Mrs. William Darrach; Lillian Gotera; Rustico Gotera; Louis Scala, teacher; Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Baker Lewis. Groton: Edward J. Breault; Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Dembo. Hart-

ford: Ben Abrams; Mildred Aslin, director of activities, Colt Local; Linda M. Ballette; Walter E. Batterson; John Anthony Barbagallo, president, U. F. W. A., No. 135; Prof. T. H. Bissonette; Julia Louise D'Agostino, health and physical education director; Ruth M. Dadourian; James C. Eagan, executive member, U. E. R. M. W. A., No. 251; Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn; Clifton H. Hert, D. D. S.; Rev. George I. H. Jackson; Eleanor Hope Johnson, Ph. D.; Mrs. Sylvia Meisner; Mabel Robbins; Rockwell Harmon Potter, dean, Hartford Theological Seminary; Primrose Woolverton, general secretary, Y. W. C. A. Hebron: Harriett C. Johnson; Nicholas C. Johnson; Rev. Harold R. Keen; Clarissa Pendleton; Susan Pendleton, reporter, Hartford Times; Helen Earle Sellers, State legislature, 1941-43. Kent: Christine R. Bull, secretary to headmaster, South Kent School. Mansfield Center: Mr. and Mrs. Jack Cantor, farmer; Virginia Wallace Wolfe; Wm. B. Wolfe, Jr. Middlebury: Louise Bakley Dillingham; Rev. William H. McCance. Middletown: Rev. J. J. Banks; Rev. Arthur E. Paterson; Charles Coleman Sellers, bibliographical librarian, Wesleyan. New Britain: Rabbi Harry Zwilling. New Canaan: Everett F. Pierce. New Haven: Sam Abrams, business agent, Journeymen Tailors Union; Deborah Cynthia Baldwin; Prof. John S. Brubacher; Rev. J. G. Butler; Clarence B. Carter, New Haven Conference to End Discrimination; Fay Copleman, medical social worker; Rev. Robert C. Denton; Prof. George Dahl; Helen B. DeNoyan; Nannie Elliott; Dr. and Mrs. Frank Engel; Rev. R. A. G. Foster; Mrs. Alice E. Howell, Yale department of education; E. W. Ireland, president, New Haven State Teachers College; Dr. Bernard L. Kartin; Miriam Keningsberg, social worker; Prof. Raymond Kennedy; Saul Kreas, business agent, Painters Union (A. F. L.); Dr. Paul H. Lavietes; Laura Belle McCoy, alderman, nineteenth ward; Lillian Mermin, assistant secretary, committee on the hygiene of housing; Prof. J. C. Neff; J. Wayne Newton, State secretary, International Workers Order; Dr. John P. Peters; Rev. John B. Pharr; Walter H. Prehn; Rev. Francis P. Randall; Mrs. Sophie Rostoneff; Nathan Sherman, editor, Union Times; Mrs. Wesley A. Sturges; Rev. W. Teague; Samuel Tourtellotte; Rev. Henry D. Trinkaus; Allan A. Twichell, secretary, committee on the hygiene of housing; Mrs. William Urbach, State chairman, public affairs, Y. W. C. A.; Frances Rhoades Weigand; Rev. C. Lawson Willard; Prof. Harold Williamson; Prof. C. E. A. Winslow; Roberta Yerkes; Mr. Bernard Siegel, research assistant, Institute of Human Relations; Charlotte Siegal, medical social worker. New London: Charles A. Beh, financial secretary-treasurer, Bricklayers Union, No. 10; Rev. Oliver W. Bell; Prof. E. A. Burdick; Fred J. Butler, trustee and executive committee, Local 30, Carpenters Union (A. F. L.); Prof. M. Robert Cobbledick; Rev. Gilbert Coffee; Paul DeLeon, Barbers Union; Stephan Hegarty; Dr. Dorothea Scoville; Rev. J. VanCattedge, Jr.; William F. Fargo, business agent, Carpenters Union, No. 30; Frank Ferri, president, Bricklayers Union, No. 10; Rev. A. A. Garvin; Raymond Gentilella, president, Barbers Union, No. 330; Paul J. Grohocki, president, Local 379; George A. Nocery, recording secretary, Printers Union, Local 1122; Prof. Josephine Hunter Ray; Prof. John Perry Seward; Daniel Chamberlain Small, Youth Welfare League; William F. Totten, president, New London Central Labor Council. New Milford: A. C. Worley, editor, New Milford Times; Ruth Erickson; Eleanor Stevenson. Newtown: Alice P. Davidson, librarian. North Franklin: Julius Schiller, farmer. Norwalk: Rev. Sewell Emerson; Lillian Fischler; George Selde, editor, In Fact; Rev. Arthur T. Tedcastle; John D. Noian, director, Norwich Taxpayers Association; Rev. Earl E. Story, superintendent, Nor-

wich District Methodist Church; Francis R. Sullivan, schoolman. Old Greenwich: J. L. Carwin, M. D. Plainville: Rev. Theodore Dixon; Ralph Corlette, president, Ramez Youth Progressive Club. Poquonock: Thomas F. Connor, community committee. Ridgefield: Mrs. Gunnar Michelsen. Scotland: Winifred R. Sloane. Seymour: Rev. Harold J. Edwards; Rev. Elsie F. Stowe. Shelton: Fred Guttman, president, Textile Union. Stamford: Harriet K. Brey; Allen Hackett; Norman Twiddy, D. D., superintendent, New York District Methodist Church; Mildred Wilcox, general secretary, Y. W. C. A. Storrs: Prof. Eric W. Carlson; Prof. George R. Hilton; Hildegard Hilton; Prof. William R. Clark; Prof. Walter Landauer; Prof. Henry G. Stetler. Stratford: Rev. Stanley Sellick; Rev. Theodore N. Johnson. Torrington: Rev. Stephan L. Kiser; Rev. Adam A. Tangarone. Washington: Rev. Wilbur S. Deming. Waterbury: Hampton Steward, president, Young Republican Club; Rev. John C. Walker. Westport: Helen Keller. Willimantic: Martha Bartlett, assistant librarian, Teachers College; Prof. Herman Beckert; Celia Belman, singer; Selma Bernstein; Prof. Ruth J. Bradley; Elizabeth E. Calchidi; Hattie F. Cohen; Tania Jukaz; Katherine Keeler, supervisor of training, Teachers College; Helena F. Miller, dean, Teachers College; Iona M. Martin; Mrs. James Meade; Frederick Noble, superintendent, training schools, Teachers College; Prof. Pauline Peters; Norma Rathbun, librarian; Mary A. Quinn, retired teacher; Prof. Katherine L. Sears; George T. Shafer, president, Teachers College; Prof. Eugene H. Sloane; Prof. Mary P. Wickware, University of Connecticut; Prof. C. Frances Willey; Laura M. Willey; Prof. J. Eugene Smith; Norma Walker; Evelyn Walker, textile worker; Bernice Woodworth, textile worker; Joseph Somers, machinist; Prof. Robert Wickware. Wilton: Sylvia R. Bloom, high-school teacher. North Windham: Sophie Landeck, teacher. Windham Center: Eve Bogan Smith; Silas B. Weeks, F. S. A. administrator; Mrs. Silas B. Weeks. Windsor: Ellen M. Ashley; Ida I. Browne, secretary to superintendent of schools; Catherine M. Craig, teacher; Rev. Donald H. Dorchester; Marian K. Faller, music supervisor, public schools; Clarence L. Fitch; Daniel Howard, superintendent of schools emeritus; M. Elizabeth Lee, teacher; Elsie M. Owen, teacher; Lawrence C. Parker; Earle S. Russell, superintendent of schools; Clifford S. Sawyer; Fern Stowe; Mary Wilson. Winsted: Frederic Drew Bond.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. HATCH), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1272. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; without amendment.

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2794. A bill to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 388).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1396. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 389).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:



S. 789. A bill to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 390);

S. 831. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 391);

S. 1223. A bill to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; without amendment (Rept. No. 392);

S. 1224. A bill to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications; without amendment (Rept. No. 393);

H. R. 2828. A bill to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 394);

H. R. 2988. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 395); and

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of Saint Elizabeths Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 396).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies; with amendments (Rept. No. 397).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; without amendment.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1309 (by request). A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; and

S. 1310 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1311. A bill to remove restrictions on Indian property now held in trust by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1312. A bill to prohibit producers and distributors of motion-picture films engaged in interstate commerce from owning, controlling, managing, operating, or having any interest in motion-picture theaters in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1313. A bill to amend section 1 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1314, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1315. A bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. McKELLAR introduced Senate bill 1316, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### ALLOWANCE OF STATE INCOME TAX AS CREDIT AGAINST FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to amend part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide for the allowance of amounts of income tax imposed by States as a credit against Federal income tax, and for other purposes.

I may state the purpose of the bill. There are 13 States in which no State income tax prevails. The result is that persons who live in States which have State income-tax laws move into the States which have none. The purpose of the bill is to allow amounts of any tax imposed by a State as a credit against Federal income tax.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1314) to amend part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide for the allowance of amounts of income tax imposed by States as a credit against Federal income tax, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the bill I have just introduced I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me by Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service, together with the statement attached thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,  
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,  
Washington, July 3, 1943.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request, we have prepared and are enclosing a manuscript in which we have set forth the rates applied to incomes of \$10,000 or more by those States which levy a tax on individual incomes. We have also listed therein the States which do not levy this tax.

With reference to the information presented, however, we are unable to assure you that no item thereof has been altered by legislation adopted in 1943 sessions of the State legislatures. Not having received a complete record of the statutes adopted by each of the States whose legislatures convened in 1943, we accordingly cannot be certain that any State, not hitherto imposing a tax on individual incomes, has not adopted this form of tax in 1943, nor whether one has been abandoned by any of the States whose rates are presented. The rates which are included were applicable until January 1943; and in only a few instances have we obtained the 1943 statutes which have enabled us to cite the rate levied for 1943.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,  
Director, Legislative Reference Service,  
LIST OF STATES HAVING NO INDIVIDUAL  
INCOME TAX

Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

STATES LEVYING A TAX ON INDIVIDUAL INCOMES—RATES ON INCOMES OVER \$10,000

Alabama: 3.2 percent on the first \$5,000 and 5 percent on the remainder.

Arizona: 2.1 percent on the first \$9,000 and 4½ percent on the remainder.

Arkansas: 2.4 percent on the first \$10,000, 4 percent on the next \$14,000, and 5 percent on the excess over \$25,000.

California: 1.5 percent on the first \$10,000, 3 percent on the next \$5,000, 4 percent on the next \$5,000, 5 percent on the next \$5,000, 6 percent on the next \$5,000, 7 percent on the next \$10,000, 8 percent on the next \$10,000, 9 percent on the next \$10,000, 10 percent on the next \$10,000, 11 percent on the next \$10,000, 12 percent on the next \$20,000, 13 percent on the next \$50,000, 14 percent on the next \$100,000, and 15 percent on the remainder.

Colorado: 6 percent plus a surtax of 2 percent on investment income.

Delaware: 3 percent plus 1 percent withheld on gross incomes for 1943 and 1944.

Georgia: 5 percent on the first \$10,000, 6 percent on \$10,000 to \$20,000, and 7 percent on incomes over \$20,000.

Idaho: 2.9 percent on the first \$5,000 and 8 percent on the remainder.

Iowa: 3 percent on the first \$5,000; 5 percent on the remainder; less a deduction of 50 percent from the tax due for 1942 and 1943.

Kansas: 4 percent.

Kentucky: 5 percent.

Louisiana: 2 percent on the first \$10,000; 4 percent on the next \$40,000; 6 percent on the excess over \$50,000.

Maryland: 5 percent on investment incomes; 2 percent on other incomes; less a deduction of 33½ percent from the total tax due.

Massachusetts: 6 percent on income from securities, debts, intangibles; 1½ percent on income from annuities; 1½ percent on other incomes; plus 13 percent of the total tax due.

Minnesota: 8 percent on incomes of \$9,000 to \$12,500; 9 percent on incomes of \$12,500 to \$20,000; 10 percent on incomes over \$20,000.

Mississippi: 3.2 percent on the first \$10,000; 5½ percent on the next \$5,000; 6½ percent on the next \$10,000; 7 percent on the excess over \$25,000.

Missouri: 4 percent; less a deduction of \$135.

Montana: 2 percent on the first \$6,000; 4 percent on the remainder.

New Hampshire: \$3.35 per \$100 of investment income. This tax is "levied at the average rate of taxation, as near as may be, levied on other property in the State." The above rate applied in 1941.

New Mexico: 2 percent on incomes of \$10,000 to \$20,000; 3 percent on incomes of \$20,000 to \$100,000; 4 percent on incomes over \$100,000.

New York: 7 percent less a deduction of 25 percent from the total tax due.

North Carolina: 7 percent.

North Dakota: 12½ percent on incomes of \$10,000 to \$15,000; 15 percent on incomes over \$15,000.

Oklahoma: 4.5 percent on the first \$8,000; 9 percent on the remainder.

Oregon: 5.8 percent on the first \$4,000; 7 percent on the remainder; plus a surtax of 2 percent provided the total does not exceed 8 percent.

South Carolina: 5 percent.

South Dakota: 1½ percent on the first \$7,000; 3 percent on the next \$8,000; 4 percent on the next \$25,000; 5 percent on the next \$100,000; 6 percent on the remainder.

Tennessee: 6 percent on investment income only.

Utah: 2½ percent on the first \$4,000; 5 percent on the remainder.

Vermont: 4 percent on investment income; 2 percent on other income.

Virginia: 3 percent.

Wisconsin: 2.8 percent on the first \$10,000; 5½ percent on the next \$1,000; 6 percent

on the next \$1,000; 7 percent on the remainder.

Source: Commerce Clearing House, State Tax Guide Service.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

#### SALE OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 392, House bill 1294 to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes, be re-committed to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### HANDLING OF LEND-LEASE CARGOES BY WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 168), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the handling of lend-lease cargoes by the War Shipping Administration. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem necessary and desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution shall be payable from funds heretofore made available for payment of the expenses of such committee.

#### APPEAL TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP FROM JASPER COUNTY (S. C.) DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution from Jasper Coun-

ty, S. C., which I wish to have read by the clerk, and then printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the South has always been the mainstay of the Democratic Party; and

Whereas in recent years the national leaders of our party have departed so from its policies and principles that it can now be recognized only by its name; and

Whereas the National Democratic Party is using the name, which is almost sacred to southern people, to hold them in line and at the same time carrying out principles and policies that are detrimental to the South: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we hereby call upon the southern leaders of our party to issue an ultimatum, in no uncertain terms, to the National Democratic Party and the national administration demanding that the policies and principles of the national administration that are detrimental to the South be abandoned, and upon their failure to heed that our leaders take whatever steps that may be necessary, regardless of how drastic, to lead us out of this intolerable situation.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Governor, lieutenant-governor, speaker of the house, State chairman, and all Members of Congress from South Carolina, and that a copy be given to the press.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to state, for the benefit of those who are interested in this resolution, that it is an illustration of the glorious character of the people of South Carolina.

#### SHIPBUILDING RECORD OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a foreign broadcast delivered by him on the shipbuilding record of the United States Maritime Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POST-WAR SETTLEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Raise a Question," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate of Saturday last, the Chair now lays before the Senate House bill 3030, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate carries very substantial increases over the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will offer an explanation and justification for the increases:

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as all the increases are due to Budget estimates which have been sent in since the bill passed the House, I think it would probably be better to discuss the reasons for each amendment as it is reached. Will that be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. WHITE. That will be perfectly agreeable.

#### TRIBUTE TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND JESSE JONES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in 1941 Arkansas had a bonded highway indebtedness of \$136,000,000. In view of the high interest rate, the obligations carried, it became most desirable, if not imperative, that the indebtedness be refunded. Under an act of the General Assembly of Arkansas in 1941, a refunding board was created and authority given to refund these highway bonds.

With the invaluable cooperation and assistance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the able direction of the Honorable Jesse Jones, this refunding program was carried out, to the very great benefit of the State of Arkansas, and I may say, incidentally, that the operation resulted in a net profit of more than \$4,000,000 to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In recognition of the valuable aid and assistance given by Mr. Jones and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to our State, the refunding board recently adopted a resolution expressing its gratitude for this splendid service and assistance. I find that a copy of the resolution appeared in the issue of the Bond Buyer of June 26, 1943, in an article entitled "Jesse Jones' Aid to Arkansas Acknowledged by Bond Refunding Board." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and I wish to say that I join in the sentiments and gratitude expressed in the resolution with respect to the splendid services of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of Mr. Jones in connection with this transaction.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### JESSE JONES' AID TO ARKANSAS ACKNOWLEDGED BY BOND REFUNDING BOARD

Recognition of the part played by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones in the refinancing of the \$136,000,000 highway indebtedness of the State of Arkansas was officially recorded in the records of the State refunding board at its last full meeting held at Little Rock on June 11, 1943.

Gov. Homer M. Adkins sends us a copy of a resolution adopted at that meeting, which, he writes, "expressed the attitude of all our people."

The resolution reads, in full, as follows:

"Whereas the original Refunding Board of the State of Arkansas, created by the general assembly of 1941, will be dissolved on June 30, 1943, and will be replaced by a board of smaller membership to carry on the operations of the refunding act of 1941; and



"Whereas during the tenure of the original board the State of Arkansas refunded bonded indebtedness in a manner reacting to the lasting benefit of the State's 2,000,000 people and to the improvement of the reputation of the State outside its borders; and

"Whereas Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones was indispensable to the various agencies, officials, groups, and individuals of Arkansas having a part in the refunding operation; and

"Whereas at a time when Arkansas' financial integrity and future stability were factors to be considered by financial houses throughout the land, Secretary Jones shrewdly and fairly appraised our State, its natural resources, its industrial possibilities, and the profound loyalty, intelligence, and moral character of its citizens, and thereupon recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it interest itself in the financing of the refunding operation; and

"Whereas to a large degree because of the nationally recognized stature of Secretary Jones, and his proven business acumen, his recommendation paved the way for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase Arkansas' new refunding bonds at an interest rate which has saved and will continue to save the taxpayers of the State approximately \$1,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas Secretary Jones' trust in Arkansas and Arkansas people and his appraisal of the State's assets, both developed and undeveloped, has been confirmed by events of the past 2½ years, not the least significant of which was the turning of the entire refunding bond issue by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to private banking concerns at a profit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of approximately \$4,000,000; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Refunding Board of the State of Arkansas, in meeting this 11th day of June 1943, That Secretary Jones be informed by the Board that the State of Arkansas and its 2,000,000 people recognize the debt of gratitude owed him and will everlastingly consider him one of the great benefactors of the State; and be it further*

*Resolved, That Secretary Jones be reassured that the people of Arkansas will continue to direct their every effort toward justifying his confidence and faith in the State of Arkansas."*

#### LOANS MADE BY AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in pursuance of my studies upon the subject of loans made by agricultural agencies, I requested the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, to provide me with the record of experience of the various agencies in the liquidation of loans, to ascertain how many of such payments were bona fide liquidations, and how many, if any, were made with money borrowed from other lending agencies. The Department has forwarded to me a letter containing the information covering the portion of the liquidations examined. I believe this information will be of value to the Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, Kansas City, Mo., June 26, 1943.

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIS: As you were informed on June 5 by Mr. Paul H. Appleby, the question in your letter of June 1 to Secretary Wickard, relative to the sources of funds used in repaying farm indebtedness, has been referred to us so that we might provide you with any available figures applicable to loans made by the institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Most of the data we have apply to long-term Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans which are made on the security of farm mortgages. Starting with January 1, 1942, we have made careful studies of the source of funds used to pay loans in full. During 1942 a total of 102,856 Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans in the amount of \$147,166,193 were paid in full. The following data show the percentage of the total number of loans paid from various sources:

Percent of total number of loans paid in full  
Principal source of funds used for repayment:

Income from farm operations.....	54
Sale of farm.....	19
Income from nonfarm occupations..	11
Sale of timber, minerals, and farm chattels.....	8
Refinancing by other lending agen- cies.....	4
All other sources.....	4

All sources..... 100

You will note that farm and nonfarm income account for the greatest proportion of pay-offs and that refinancing accounts for only 4 percent of the total.

A small proportion of the loans paid in full from funds derived from sale of the farm represents sales which were financed by other lending agencies. Our data on this point cover only the last 6 months of 1942. Of the total loans paid in full from funds derived from the sale of the farm during this period, approximately 22 percent represents cases in which the money was borrowed by the purchaser from another lending agency.

You may be interested also in the trend of paid-in-full loans over the past 5 years. The following data show the trend both in number of loans and in dollar amount:

#### NUMBER OF LOANS PAID IN FULL

Year	Federal land banks	Land Bank Commis- sioner	Total	Percent paid in full to total out- standing at beginning of each year
1938..	11,068	10,903	21,971	2.0
1939..	13,718	13,267	26,985	2.5
1940..	15,778	14,545	30,323	2.9
1941..	25,407	24,704	50,111	4.8
1942..	51,240	51,616	102,856	10.1

#### AMOUNT OF LOANS PAID IN FULL

Year	Federal land banks	Land Bank Commis- sioner	Total	Percent paid in full to total out- standing at beginning of each year
1938..	\$25,881,316	\$13,001,528	\$38,882,844	1.4
1939..	34,165,239	15,403,401	49,568,640	1.8
1940..	36,733,513	14,996,515	51,730,028	2.0
1941..	56,119,296	23,369,042	79,488,338	3.2
1942..	101,298,823	45,867,370	147,166,193	6.2

Although statistics directly related to the source of repayments of production credit association loans are not available, we have some information which indicates that a

very small portion of the cash repayments have been made from loans obtained elsewhere.

Last year a survey was made of 74 of the 529 production credit associations, which included 6 or 7 typical associations in each of the 12 farm credit districts. The purpose of the survey was to study turn-over in membership. As of July 1, 1941, the 74 selected associations had 36,571 active members, and 1 year later the survey disclosed that 8,267 of these members no longer had outstanding loans. The reasons why these members were no longer borrowing were broken down into classifications such as "quit farming," "moved out of territory," "deceased," "able to operate on own funds," and "financing elsewhere."

The survey showed that 54 percent were not borrowing because they were able to operate on their own funds. Only 1,614, or 4.4 percent of the 36,571 members covered by the survey, were financing their credit needs elsewhere. These included members who had completely repaid their production credit association loans from income and also those who had refinanced the unpaid balance elsewhere. We do not have the number or the amount of the loans refinanced.

The production credit associations during 1942 made loans amounting to \$477,714,587, of which \$84,970,947 constituted renewals, leaving cash advances of \$392,743,620. Cash repayments during the year amounted to \$395,281,233, or 100.7 percent of the cash advances.

We shall be glad to provide any further available information that you may desire.

Sincerely,

A. G. BLACK, Governor.

#### RELIEF OF FARMERS DAMAGED BY FLOODS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to offer an amendment to the pending deficiency appropriation bill when the proper time comes, but I shall be governed entirely in that respect by the wishes of the Senator from Tennessee. Several days ago I discussed on the floor of the Senate and introduced Senate bill 1286, to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943. I had previously offered the measure as an amendment when the flood control bill was pending in the Senate. At the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. Overton] in charge of the bill, I withdrew the amendment, and offered it as a separate bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and favorably reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator read to the Senate the language of the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, I have not. I was not going to offer it as an amendment. I was going to ask the Senator from Tennessee, as soon as I completed my statement, if he had any objection to temporarily laying aside the appropriation bill for the purpose of permitting, if unanimous consent can be obtained, consideration of this bill authorizing an appropriation, with the idea of making it in order as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will consideration of the measure take long?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not wish to delay the consideration of the appropriation bill in the least.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the understanding that the appropriation measure again will be laid before the Senate, I am willing to accede to the Senator's request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senate in all fairness that after the bill had been reported—it had been twice before the Senate—objection was made to it. I have discussed the matter with Senators who objected, and I find that they do not object at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered so that it may be in order as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Missouri has conferred with at least two Senators on this side of the Chamber who had previously voiced objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And their objection is removed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Their objection is removed, with the understanding that I make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1286) to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, before the word "rehabilitation", to insert the word "temporary", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement with respect to the bill because it presents a rather unusual proposition. The bill provides for a direct appropria-

tion for rehabilitation of land which has been removed from production by reason of the floods which have occurred in certain areas of the United States this year after the planting had been done, or in some cases before planting had been done, and which destroyed the fencing, the agricultural implements, and other necessities for the production of a crop this year.

The bill proceeds entirely on the theory that this appropriation should be made, not as a measure of benefit to the farmers involved, but as a measure of restoration of crop production in some of the very richest agricultural lands in the United States, in order that production may not be any more diminished this year than is absolutely inevitable. In other words, Mr. President, on much of this overflowed land it is still possible, with proper aid from the Government, to make a crop of corn, or soybeans, or other very vital agricultural elements, but it cannot be done without direct Government aid at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to know if it is the intention of the Senator from Missouri that the Secretary of Agriculture, through his various subdivisions and bureaus, shall administer this appropriation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say that it is, and I will say to the Senator from Connecticut further that I made inquiry of the Disaster Loan Corporation, in fact, of every governmental agency I could think of, and all of them recognized the very vital necessity for the restoration of production in the flooded area, but none of them felt that under existing conditions they had exact authority to administer it, and it seemed to me that the only place where the administration of the act could be placed was in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. It is the purpose of the Senator further, as I understand, to rehabilitate farmers in the matter of producing crops this year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And for this year only. The measure in terms is limited to this year. I will say further that the report of the committee specifically states that the proposed action is not intended to be a precedent, and that it is only recommended by the committee for the reason that the serious emergency of a food shortage, due to our great war effort, and our obligations to our allies and to our civilian population, as well as our armed forces, makes it necessary for the Government to use every possible measure to bring about the increase and the maintenance of our maximum production this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose that in the course of adminis-

tration the Secretary of Agriculture, through his agents, shall try to rehabilitate the farmers who can make a crop this year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly the purpose of the measure, and its only purpose. I will say further to the Senator from Connecticut that if I had known how to make more specific the standards necessary to attain the aim which he has himself just stated, I should have been very happy to do so. In view of the fact that if anything is to be done this year it must be done immediately, it seemed to me that the only thing which could be done under the circumstances was to make it discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, but I have indicated in the committee's report, which I personally wrote, that it is the purpose to use this as an emergency measure only and simply for the restoration of production on this valuable agricultural land.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, a reading of the bill will disclose that no standards are being prescribed by the Congress as to just how the fund is to be administered. Under the circumstances it seemed to me advisable, in the light of the explanation of the Senator from Missouri, to set forth briefly by means of this colloquy a legislative recital of the purposes the Senator has in mind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appreciate the questions asked by the Senator from Connecticut, and I realize that the bill is not so specific as I myself should like to have it. If it were possible, I would go into more detail as to the particular situations which have occurred by reason of the recent floods.

Mr. President, the bill itself applies to all flood situations in the United States, but I happen to have particular knowledge of the flood situation in the Missouri Valley, where there have occurred three separate and distinct floods this year, each one of which in itself was greater than any we have had since 1903, a period of 40 years. The whole aim of the bill is to see that much of the richest agricultural land in the United States shall not be retired from production for this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose that any of the funds to be appropriated shall be limited in allotment to a given farmer?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not. My theory is that the Secretary of Agriculture should be permitted to use the funds to the maximum extent necessary to restore production. I can say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my State the best estimates I have been able to obtain, and they are necessarily preliminary estimates, are that damage in excess of \$40,000,000 has been suffered this year because of floods.



It is not the purpose of the bill, assuming that the bill were in itself sufficient, to authorize the expenditure of \$40,000,000. The purpose is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to restore production, insofar as it may be possible to do so this year, in any area where floods have interfered with the production of foodstuffs.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one other question, if the Senator will further yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Assuming that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that certain kinds and amounts of farm machinery are necessary on certain farms, is it the Senator's purpose to have such farm machinery, which might have a life of many years, nevertheless purchased and granted to the particular farmer, without charge, and without any ultimate recompense to the Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that under the provisions of the measure the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to impose such conditions as may be necessary in connection with the use of the money. That might include conditions as to the use of agricultural machinery or conditions as to the making of terms, when terms may be made. I say to the Senator from Connecticut that the proposal is not intended as an outright gift to anyone, but simply as a measure of protection to production in that very rich agricultural area.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I objected to consideration of the bill the other day, on the call of the calendar, because of the fact that the language of the bill left the situation wide open. It seems to me Congress should create some standards by which the Secretary of Agriculture would be guided in his administration of the allotment of the \$15,000,000. I grant the laudability of the purpose of the Senator from Missouri, that the production loans the farmers should have this year shall be made to them, because of the impending food shortage. Because I share the feeling of the Senator from Missouri that such production is desirable, I have withdrawn my objection to consideration of the bill, in the hope that what has been said here will be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture as a guide in the administration of the grant, for, obviously, otherwise it would have no strings attached to it, and no other base by which the administration could be guided.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I desire briefly to express the hope that the proposal of the Senator from Missouri will prevail. I doubt that many Senators have his appreciation of the current farm situation in the Middle West, in the Missouri Valley, and the valleys of the other rivers which have just suffered such serious floods. At this hour much of the very rich farmland of that area is still under water. Much of the fertile land has been

deteriorated by the floods, and the harmful effect continues. My colleague is quite correct in the assumption that there will be a serious need for additional farm equipment for those engaged in agriculture in that section of the country. I make this statement now, particularly in the hope that I may impress upon those who will have charge of the matter the need of making available at the earliest possible moment farm equipment, farm tools, and the other things which are so urgently required by the farmers of the stricken areas. What is now going on, or not going on, will, in my judgment—and I hope I am in error—add to a food shortage which I fear will come upon us some months hence. I do not think many persons have a very clear understanding of the food situation. I do not know what Congress can do about it at this particular hour; but I know that some of the agencies of Government can do something about it. One of the things with which I am most concerned is that the equipment, the tools, the fences, and the seed, if necessary, and every other possible bit of help be provided for the farmers now so that they may be enabled to feed their countrymen, and perhaps be enabled, although I am not so optimistic about this, to help feed the people of the stricken countries of Europe which we shall take over, or release from bondage, in the successful advance of our armed forces.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I desire to say a few words on the subject of threatened danger to food production. I have just this morning returned from the State of Wisconsin. What has been said suggests to my mind that there has been a fulfillment of the prophecy made on the floor of the Senate some months ago that a tragic loss of food would result if the Government failed to make available adequate machinery and manpower. Because we have had cold weather we in Wisconsin can say that only approximately 10 percent of the pea crop which has ripened up to date has been lost. But, Mr. President, I am sorry to say that some of the skim milk of Wisconsin is flowing into the sewers because there was not made available the capacity to take care of the production.

However, as has been said by the Senator from Connecticut, this is merely the beginning of the tragedy. Unless Congress can cause persons in authority somewhere to comprehend the picture, the tragedy will be multiplied many times.

Something has been said by the Senator about the lack of machinery. Until about two years and a half ago the farmers of the Middle West had been experiencing very poor prices. This poor-price period extended over a period of two decades. As a result, the machinery they had been accumulating was partially worn out. Then what has been called the prosperous era came upon them. Now they cannot buy machinery.

Let me cite an instance. Saturday morning and afternoon, in my home city, farmers came from the neighborhood of Fall Creek, in the adjoining county. They came in groups in the morning and in the afternoon. What were they asking for? They said, "Senator, you have got to get out of the Army a man who can do the welding to repair the farm machinery in the Fall Creek area." That is all they asked for. In other words, the men have been drained off the farms and from the villages, and all the farm machinery the farmers have accumulated in 10, 20, or 30 years is wearing out. All they ask is to have someone to keep it going. They asserted, "Unless we can get a welder in this area"—and it is a great production area—"we will not be able to pull through. Our crop will spoil."

If this soldier-welder could only be released on furlough until after the silos have been filled in the fall, they could make a go of it. The farmers say, "We are raising a big crop, but much of it will go to waste unless machinery is made available."

Mr. President, that is the machinery side of the picture. In the State of Wisconsin, unless some help is given by way of providing manpower for the farmers and for the canners, the 10 percent of the pea crop of which I have spoken, which has already been lost up to date, will be multiplied many times. I repeat what I said 2 weeks ago, that this year Wisconsin should harvest from 40 to 45 percent of the pea crop of the Nation; and yet there has been no one in charge who has seen the over-all need. As a result we have been stalemated.

What is needed? There must be someone, somewhere, who senses the need of doing the job, and knows how to do it.

Weeks ago I took up the question with Mr. McNutt. The result has been an attempt to get somewhere. I spoke on the floor of the Senate and illustrated my contention by citing the fact that in Tunisia the government officials harvested the crop to preserve it for our boys and for the Tunisians. In north Africa there were some brains in the picture. But here in American we piddle and fool around. What we need is someone who can sense the serious challenge to the food supply of the Nation.

First, the farmer must have manpower. Farmer after farmer in my State has told me, "We have not the manpower to harvest the crops which are coming on." Think of that. Ordinarily we might say that that is the farmer's concern. It is not now. It is the Nation's concern. If we are to feed the boys in service we must have manpower.

To whom are we to turn? If in Tunisia the Army did the job, why, in God's name, can we not get the boys from the camps here to do the job?

Secondly, the farmers must have machinery. If they cannot get new machinery they must have men who can repair the old machinery. That is not simply to aid the farmer. It is for the Nation,

Machinery is a part of the production line. In big business we provide machines for the manufacture of ammunition and weapons. There is no more important munition than food, so we must have machinery on the food front. In Wisconsin we must have manpower to go into the canneries and other plants which produce the food. What is typical of my State is typical of many other States. There is a lack of authority and vision on the part of some Government officials. We must get under this problem at once, or the tragedy which will follow will be of such large proportions that millions of our people will begin to see red, and when the people on the home front see red we must beware lest the morale break. Listen to the words of one of Wisconsin's harassed citizens:

I will tell you straight from the shoulder, Senator, that unless something is done to relieve the manpower shortage during the late packs the canning industry will hesitate in contracting a vast amount of acreage for the season of 1944, for they are sick and tired of hearing promises from the officials who are in charge of the food program, and by the way, who do not know what the inside of a canning factory looks like, and I doubt very much if they know the difference between a can of peas and a can of beans.

We are tired of having theorists tell us what to do, and it is time that someone is put in charge of this food program who knows what the conditions are in the field and who has brains enough to know what to do to solve the many problems which we have. It is just impossible to have someone sit behind his desk in Washington and try to formulate a plan which is workable, or the entire canning industry throughout the United States. Each State has its own problems, and even within States we have our different problems, so how in hell can anyone in Washington make one definite rule and regulation which will govern the entire country?

Mr. President, I trust that these words will have some effect, and that the appropriate authority will take action.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to support the plea which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has made in behalf of the passage of Senate bill 1286. Let me add to what the Senator from Missouri has stated that the floods which occurred in May of this year in eastern Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas were the highest for 99 years. Rivers rose to a higher point than they had reached since 1844.

Several weeks ago the Governor of Oklahoma and representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri came to Washington to obtain relief. In company with other Senators, I went with them to call on the Bureau of Public Roads, and on the W. P. B., in the interest of priorities. Finally we went to Mr. Chester Davis, who at that time was War Food Administrator, and discussed possible means of obtaining relief. I have no doubt that those agencies have gone into action to the best of their ability.

About a month ago I went to Kansas to attend the funeral of a late Member of the Kansas delegation. On my return, in passing through the center of

the State, I saw more water in the Missouri River Valley than I had ever seen before, along the Missouri-Pacific Railroad from Jefferson City nearly to St. Louis. For the second time in less than 2 months, the Missouri River had reached record heights. In my own home county in Kansas, in the month of May the rainfall was 20 inches, a remarkable fall of rain. There had been nothing like it previously in our history.

I hope that the bill of the senior Senator from Missouri will pass without any dissent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the pending measure, and I hope that it will be passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I thank Senators who have spoken in favor of the bill. May we have a vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay a vote on the bill. However, I think the bill is so vague that in view of the present condition in the Department of Agriculture there should be a clarifying amendment. Senators are aware of the fact that the Farm Security Administration has been the agency in the Department which has heretofore undertaken to afford relief to areas which were affected by flood, drought, or the ravages of insects. I do not insist that we should write into the bill the name of the Farm Security Administration; but in view of the fact that the Farm Security Administration has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the Administrator of War Food Production and Distribution, certainly there should be some language in the bill which would obviate the creation of an entirely new bureau or agency in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will suggest an amendment I shall be very glad to accept it. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that as the bill was first drawn the authority was vested in the Food Administrator. Then, after consultation with all the agencies involved, including the Disaster Loan Corporation, the Federal Security Administration, and every other agency I could think of, it was decided that the Secretary of Agriculture was the proper administrative authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no doubt as to that. I agree with that statement. I think the Secretary of Agriculture is the appropriate authority, because he is the head of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not wish to create any new administrative agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to suggest that the bill be amended by providing that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized, through any existing agency or bureau, to provide relief to any such farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall be very glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I move that in line 6, after the word "authorized", the words "to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Alabama, although I am under obligation to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that if this measure requires an undue length of time, I am bound to withdraw it.

Mr. HILL. When the bill was under consideration a few days ago I made a suggestion about the use of the Farm Security Administration, because that would make it definite and specific. The Senator from Georgia has called attention to the fact that the Farm Security Administration is now under the War Food Administration. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia were written into the bill, could the Secretary of Agriculture make use of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think he could, because it is all within the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Is the War Food Administrator under the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will not press that question, because the division of authority between the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator is in a very nebulous state. I have never been able to determine exactly where the authority of one ceases and the authority of the other begins, but they are both in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has stated that the Farm Security Administration is the agency which has the duty and responsibility of rehabilitation of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has heretofore engaged in this specific work in flooded areas.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. It provided relief in Alabama.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Farm Security Administration rather disclaimed any authority in this particular kind of work, and therefore it was necessary to make the authority broad, or even, as the Senator from Georgia has properly said, vague. If I could have made it any more specific, I certainly would have done so. If any one agency of the Government had claimed specific jurisdiction, I would have drawn the bill so as to confer jurisdiction on such agency; but what I was interested in was in having something done, and putting the responsibility somewhere. The proper thing to do seemed to be to confer the authority upon the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than to undertake to pass a measure which might later be said to have conferred jurisdiction on



some agency which should not have jurisdiction.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, under the language of his amendment, the Senator from Georgia does not have any doubt that the Secretary of Agriculture could use the Farm Security Administration for carrying out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think he could, and I believe he probably should utilize it.

Mr. HILL. That is my thought.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my understanding is that the modification suggested by the Senator from Georgia has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1286) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I assume that we have now returned to the consideration of the second deficiency appropriation bill. While the matter is fresh in the minds of Senators, out of order I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to be inserted at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations, and for that purpose, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative—House of Representatives," on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

### COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount, which is hereby authorized, to enable the Joint Committee on Re-

duction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, \$10,000; to enable the committee to perform the additional duties required of it by section 204 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 30, 1943, \$10,000, in all, \$20,000, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Working capital and congressional printing and binding: For an additional amount for working capital and congressional printing and binding, fiscal year 1944, \$17,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be returned to the Treasury as an unexpended balance not later than 12 months after the close of the fiscal year 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to insert:

Working capital and congressional printing and binding 1943: The amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register is hereby increased to \$430,000 for the fiscal year 1943: *Provided*, That no increase is thereby made in the existing appropriation for working capital and congressional printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

For payment to Preston L. George, Bjarne J. Sigurdson, Harry E. Padgett, and Lester A. Wells, messengers on night duty during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, \$600 each; in all, \$2,400, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—National Resources Planning Board," on page 4, line 6, after the numerals "\$29,500", to insert "\$42,500", and in line 11, before the word "shall", to strike out "\$37,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies", on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

### BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Salaries and expenses: For the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, in carrying out the functions thereof as created by the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 849 and 852), as further amended by the act of May 21, 1943 (Public Law 53), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, fiscal year 1944, \$65,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for obligation unless and until there shall have been enacted an extension of said act for a period beyond August 24, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

### FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

War-area child-care (national defense): For payments to States, local public authorities, and nonprofit private agencies as pro-

vided by Public, No. — (S. 1130, 78th Cong.), for expenditure in accordance with State plans, submitted and approved as provided in that act, for day care and extended school services for children of mothers employed in industries essential to the prosecution of the war, fiscal year 1944, \$20,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses of the Federal Security Agency (and other Federal agencies on transfer thereto) necessary for carrying out the foregoing program of war-area child-care, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, including actual transportation and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation in an advisory capacity to the Federal Security Administrator; and printing and binding (not to exceed \$30,000), fiscal year 1944, \$450,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchases from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 14, to insert:

The sums appropriated in the two preceding paragraphs shall not be available for obligation until the enactment of the bill (S. 1130 of the 78th Cong.) entitled "An act to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 6, after line 20, to insert:

War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, and 1541), \$75,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed \$3,375,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for obligation until the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2936 of the 78th Cong.) entitled "An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert:

Public Roads Administration, Inter-American Highway (Costa Rica): For surveys and construction of the Inter-American Highway (provided for by the act of December 26, 1941 (Public Law 375), but without regard to the provisions thereof), within the borders of the Republic of Costa Rica between Cartago and San Isidro del General, and necessary expenses incident thereto, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am curious about the language, if I may call it to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee, contained in the amendment. This apparently is an appropriation to build a sector of the International Highway in Costa Rica at our expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And it is identified by the words:

Provided for by the act of December 26, 1941, \* \* \* but without regard to the provisions thereof.

Just what are we getting out from under by that language?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me examine it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refer to the language on page 7, in lines 18, 19, and 20. We identify the act under which the appropriation is authorized, and then promptly climb out from under it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read the explanation furnished by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Certain sections of the Inter-American Highway, from Laredo, Tex., to the Panama Canal, have been completed with funds provided by the governments of the Central American countries and with funds contributed by the United States, including appropriations made available under the provisions of Public Law 375 (77th Cong.), approved December 26, 1941, which authorized the appropriation of \$20,000,000 for expenditure on the survey and construction of the highway, provided that at least one-third of the costs would be assumed by each of the countries involved.

In June 1942 the Army ordered the construction of pioneer roads to connect completed sections of the Inter-American Highway so that a passable road would be available at the earliest possible date for war purposes. The rough terrain in a 58-mile stretch between Cartago and San Isidro del General in the highest part of the mountains in Costa Rica does not admit of adequate traffic solution by the construction of a pioneer road and the Public Roads Administration proposes to proceed with the construction of this stretch of road as soon as the necessary funds are appropriated.

The Department of State advises that the country of Costa Rica is financially unable to contribute toward the cost of construction on this particular section which, because of its extraordinarily rough terrain, will be the most costly section along the entire route of the Inter-American Highway.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation is required to meet contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1944, and its approval is recommended.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the complete use of the road will be prevented until this construction is completed. There are very high mountains in the uncompleted section of the road, and unless it is built much of the road for which we have already spent a great deal of money will be useless in time of war. It is regarded as very important that the road be completed.

In view of all the money which we have already spent—and we have spent some very large sums of money on this road—I myself believe that we should have it completed at the earliest possible moment, and the only way in which we can do so is by an expenditure of the amount recommended of \$12,000,000. That is the whole truth of the matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am still asking about what the language means. From the Senator's explanation I assume that Public Law 375 would require from Costa Rica a contribution, and the purpose of this amendment is to omit it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is to omit it because the State Department has advised that Costa Rica is financially unable to contribute to the cost of the proposed construction. As the Senator will agree, \$12,000,000 is a very considerable sum to expend in order to complete and make passable the road from the Panama Canal to the United States. For that reason that amendment is offered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then further in the bill on page 17 we are implementing the recent treaty signed with Panama by paying the \$2,500,000 cost of a substantial portion of the International Highway in Panama.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I assume that we are now dropping any pretense that this is a partnership expenditure in this International Highway and that we are, as usual, paying the whole bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are not paying the whole bill we are paying a very large part of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wanted to be sure the record was straight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. President, has the amendment on page 7, line 16, been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 7, after line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

#### NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940 (42 U. S. C., ch. 9), as amended, and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), \$150,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for obligation until the date of enactment of legislation authorizing the appropriation of such additional funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 11, to insert:

Not exceeding \$7,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation made available until June 30, 1943, under the heading "Emergency fund for the President, defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is continued available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 17, to insert:

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

##### PUBLIC WELFARE

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For an additional amount for support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, fiscal year 1943, \$68,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 23, to insert:

#### JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments, including costs, rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 90, together with such further sum as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment, \$2,916.86.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 6, to insert:

#### DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 13, to insert:

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Development of civil landing areas: For completion of landing area construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, \$8,832,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of \$8,832,000 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

For the Bituminous Coal Division, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828-849), as further amended by the act of May 21, 1943 (Public Law 53), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, including not to exceed \$1,000 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$500 for the purchase and exchange of newspapers, lawbooks, reference books, and periodicals, fiscal year 1944, \$1,100,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available unless and until there shall have been enacted an extension of said act for a period beyond August 24, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 20, to insert:

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Patrick Henry National Monument: For completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill, and including all expenses incidental to such acquisition, to be known as the Patrick Henry National Monument, in accordance with the provisions of



the acts of August 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 652), and January 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 18), fiscal year 1944, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 14, in line 13, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 82, and"; and line 15, after the name "Congress", to strike out "\$10,-628.05" and insert "\$19,605.37."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard," on page 14, line 24, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 81, and", and on page 15, line 2, after the name "Congress", to strike out "\$882.88" and insert "\$1,025.58."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department", on page 17, after line 20, to insert:

#### BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Salaries and expenses, deposit of withheld taxes: For all necessary expenses, fiscal year 1944, incident to the deposit of withheld taxes in Government depositories pursuant to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed \$113,000 for printing and binding; and reimbursement to Federal Reserve banks for printing and other necessary expenses, \$800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 20, to insert:

#### WAR DEPARTMENT—CIVIL FUNCTIONS CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Rivers and harbors: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, to be available until expended, \$7,095,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to call the attention of the able Senator from Tennessee to the language authorizing the \$7,000,000 appropriation to the Corps of Engineers. It reads:

And for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head—

And so forth. This appears to be a blanket appropriation which could be expended upon any project heretofore authorized even though the Congress declined to make an appropriation for it. As the language stands, is not that the fact?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is the same language that has been constantly used in all these bills for many years. In the use of that language we simply followed the regular form. We had General Reybold before us, and that language was submitted by the Department.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator will find that heretofore we have sometimes used language somewhat more restrictive than that. Let me give the Senator an example. We authorized, for instance, an appropriation for the Florida ship canal, and then the Senate declined to make the appropriation. Can

a part of the \$7,000,00 be used for that purpose under this language?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the hearings have been printed, but that was exactly the question I asked General Reybold in the hearings before this amendment was agreed to by the committee. He said that it would not be so used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. He may have said it would not, but I am asking if it could not?

Mr. McKELLAR. He said it could not. Mr. VANDENBERG. Would not that be the prosecution of a project heretofore authorized?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. I may say that in the committee I raised precisely the same question the Senator from Michigan now raises on the floor, that some of this work would have to be done on the Intracoastal Canal from some point in Texas to a point in Florida near the proposed Florida Canal, and I asked specifically if any of the money was to be used on the Florida Canal. I was told by General Reybold it would not be so used. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] was present at the hearings, and I think it was agreed by everyone there that there was no purpose, and there was no possibility of the money being used for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Michigan. I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if that is not correct?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct. The testimony shows that the sole purpose of the amendment is to provide funds for the completion of the existing Intracoastal Canal and to widen and deepen the existing channel—not to extend it—running from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex. Most of the work on the Florida end of it has been done. There remained to be done only a little work east of the Mississippi in the vicinity of New Orleans, and that will be completed, according to the testimony, as I recall, by July 15.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not objecting to that expenditure; I am simply raising the question—

Mr. OVERTON. I am undertaking further to answer the Senator. I call attention of the Senator from Michigan to the statement in the report made by the committee that—

This amount is necessary to complete the authorized work on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, between Carrabelle, Fla., and Corpus Christi, Tex.

Therefore that binds the appropriation to be utilized solely for that purpose. The testimony is that none of it will be used for the Florida barge canal or ship canal, and the report of the committee limits it to the widening and

deepening of this channel between Carrabelle and Corpus Christi.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Louisiana will concede, will he not, that under the language, "and for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized" this appropriation can be used for anything heretofore authorized regardless of whether Congress has declined to pursue the authorization with an appropriation or not? Is not that true, under this language?

Mr. OVERTON. I made the same observation which the Senator has made, but I was advised by the clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee that this was the language uniformly used in making appropriations of this character, and that the limitation embodied in the report of the committee restricts the purposes for which the appropriation may be expended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think it will be appropriate at this time and may help the Senator if I should read from page 25 of the hearings before the committee:

Senator McKELLAR. Senator Overton, may I inquire if this appropriation affects the question of whether there will be a Florida canal.

Senator OVERTON. Oh, no, indeed; absolutely not. This has nothing at all to do with the Florida Canal. It takes the Gulf Intracoastal Canal as it now is and deepens it and widens it and straightens out some of the bends, but it has nothing whatsoever to do, I assure you, with extending the Gulf Intracoastal Canal across Florida.

Senator McKELLAR. I am glad to hear you say that because I am sure there would be great opposition on the floor.

Senator OVERTON. I am very glad you brought that out.

Senator McKELLAR. If it was just suggested that this \$7,000,000 was to be used for that purpose, the item would be no doubt—

At that point I interrupted:

Senator OVERTON. I will ask General Reybold to make a statement on that.

Senator McKELLAR. All right.

Senator OVERTON. Are any funds contemplated to be appropriated under this amendment to be used toward the construction of what is known as the Florida barge canal?

General REYBOLD. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Or any approach to it?

General REYBOLD. No, sir.

Senator McCARRAN. The Intercoastal Canal, when completed, if I understand it right—an approach to the Florida barge canal—that is, it would lead into and facilitate the transportation through the Florida barge canal when it is constructed.

General REYBOLD. The funds now requested are to be applied to the existing Intracoastal Waterway between Corpus Christi, Tex., and Carrabelle, Fla.

Senator TYDINGS. It is nothing new; it is simply an improvement of the old.

General REYBOLD. That is correct.

Senator TYDINGS. It is not a provision for a new project in any manner, shape, or form.

General REYBOLD. Except as modified by straightening out bends and deepening and widening an existing waterway.

Senator TYDINGS. Oh, yes.

General REYBOLD. And taking into consideration.

I do not know what is meant by that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with the recital by the able Senator from

Tennessee of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, and assuming that what the Senator has said is an authentic disclosure of this totally unlimited language, and the ends for which the money is to be spent, I am content to rest upon the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator will be perfectly safe in doing so, because I know that after giving testimony of that kind to a committee of the Congress no official of the Government would ever violate General Reybold's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning on page 18, line 21, and ending on page 19, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 4, to insert:

Flood control, general: For the prosecution of a dam and reservoir project on Mosquito Creek, Ohio, authorized by the acts of June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941, \$4,385,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this appropriation is necessary by reason of a peculiar situation at Youngstown, Ohio. At that place, as I recall, approximately 92 percent of the steel produced in this country is manufactured, and when there is a flood—as there was last winter, which came within an inch or half an inch of the top of the dam—if the dam should be broken the production of steel would be stopped for quite a while.

In order to correct that condition it is necessary to build another dam and improve the present one, which will have two effects. First, it will prevent the accumulation of too much water, during a flood in the wintertime, and in the summertime it will prevent a scarcity of water. It is necessary to have both dams in order to bring about that result. Senators can readily appreciate that, in a community such as Youngstown, where so much of the steel of the country is manufactured, we cannot afford to leave it to chance, but we must protect the production of steel. That is why the amendment was offered.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the committee, presented the situation to the committee, and the amendment was agreed to, although we changed the wording of the provision so as to appropriate the actual money out of the Treasury, because it was doubted that there would be sufficient money in the unexpended balance.

If the Senator from Ohio wishes to explain further, I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I merely wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for his interest in this project, and his clear statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee

a general question, not related to the immediate amendment.

I have heard that the bill carries somewhere in it a preliminary appropriation for the expenses of the American section of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is, I wish to say that I am in utter ignorance of it. Someone has put something over on me if there is anything like that in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have been looking to see if someone has put something over on me, too, and I cannot find it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have conferred with the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Everard Smith, who is one of the most experienced men in the matter of appropriations of whom I know, and he tells me he does not know of anything like that, and I am sure if such a matter had been brought before the committee I would have remembered something about it. I have no recollection of any such thing, and do not believe it is in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

Flood control, general (emergency fund): For the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods, in accordance with the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes" (S. 1134, 78th Cong.), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—property damage claims," on page 20, after line 19, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 83, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Federal Works Agency, \$2,313.67;  
Department of Agriculture, \$92.40;  
Department of Commerce, \$97.78;  
Navy Department, \$3,651.10;  
In all, \$6,154.95.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts," on page 21, after line 23, to insert:

(b) For the payment of judgments, including cost of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by United States district courts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damages caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the

United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (46 U. S. C. 781-789), and which was certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress in Senate Document No. 80 under the Navy Department, \$6,688.72, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as and where specified in such judgments or as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 11, to insert:

(c) For payment of the judgments rendered against the United States by the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, Charlotte Division, pursuant to the law entitled "Conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims against the United States of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, Radiator Special Co., and the R. and W. Motor Lines, Inc.," approved October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 958), and certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress in Senate Document No. 78 under the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, \$19,864.80.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the bottom of page 22, line 24, after the figures "\$19,864.80," I desire to offer the amendment I send to the desk, to perfect the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 22, after the figures in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following "together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as and where specified in such judgments or as provided by law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 25, before the word "None", to strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, before the word "Payment", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 23, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 79 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all the other amendments, down to section 302, are amendments relating to audited claims, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc. The Government has to pay the claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the amendments referred to are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 23, after "Public Buildings Administration", to strike out "\$64,260.63" and insert "\$100,393.28."



On page 23, after line 18, to insert:  
Veterans' Administration, \$1,293.13.

On page 23, after line 23, to insert:  
Post Office Department, \$364,423.43.

On page 23, at the end of line 25, in the item for the Treasury Department, to strike out "\$2,622.42" and insert "\$71,-986.31."

On page 24, at the end of line 1, in the item for the War Department, to strike out "\$132,709.28" and insert "\$147,-991.38."

On page 24, line 2, after the words "In all", to strike out "\$232,578.66" and insert "\$719,064.86."

On page 33, after line 16, to insert:

Sec. 204. (b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1940 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 84, Seventy-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

The Judiciary: For fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, \$25.

Independent offices: For Securities and Exchange Commission, \$24.06.

For motor transport regulation, Interstate Commerce Commission, \$44.13.

For salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission, \$47.14.

For administrative expenses, Public Works Administration, \$7.07.

For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration, \$72.80.

For operating supplies for public buildings, Public Buildings Administration, \$497.31.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, \$119.20.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, \$20.55.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$12.50.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 50 cents.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, \$550.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, \$3.65.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), \$380.69.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, \$325.64.

For land utilization and retirement of submarginal land, Department of Agriculture, \$480.

For liquidation and management of resettlement projects, Department of Agriculture, \$249.50.

For loans to farmers in drought- and storm-stricken areas, emergency relief, \$23.27.

Department of Commerce: For Civil Aeronautics Authority fund, \$6,920.

For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, \$1,737.50.

For increase of compensation, Department of Commerce, \$69.50.

For salaries, Patent Office, \$1,248.34.

Department of the Interior: For migratory bird conservation fund, Department of the Interior (receipt limitation), \$288.40.

For Indian school support, \$93.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, \$23.71.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, Lands Division, Department of Justice, \$15.

For salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth, Department of Justice, \$13.52.

Navy Department: For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, \$29,254.

For rebuilding and repairing stations, etc., Coast Guard, \$20.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, \$1,673.49.

For aviation, Navy, \$33,766.56.

For aviation, 1933 contracts, Navy, \$585.60.

For miscellaneous expenses, Navy, \$1.35.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$1.05.

For contingent expenses, Coast Guard (Navy), \$15.78.

For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, Coast Guard (Navy), \$60.69.

Treasury Department: For collecting the internal revenue, \$24.92.

War Department: For clothing and equip-

age, Army, \$62.40.

For Signal Service of the Army, \$36,492.91.

For citizens' military training camps, \$1.62.

For travel of the Army, \$45.75.

For Army transportation, \$125.28.

For pay of the Army, \$7.18.

For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, \$36.99.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), \$1,676.49.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act March 31, 1933), \$37.30.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act June 19, 1934), \$40.61.

For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer from emergency conservation work to War, act June 19, 1934), \$9.58.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act February 9, 1937), \$20.16.

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), \$117,251.89, together with such additional

sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign

currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting

Office.

On page 38, line 8, after the word "in",

to insert "Senate Document Numbered

85, and"; and in line 9, after the numerals

"227", to strike out "\$5,857.99" and insert

"\$5,973.67."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

clerk will state the next amendment of

the committee.

The next amendment was, under the

heading "Title III—General Provisions,"

on page 39, line 6, after the word "appro-

priations", to strike out "contained here-

in" and insert "in this act in whole or in

part for the fiscal year 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That

completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I

wish to offer an amendment, but I yield

to the Senator from Arizona, who wishes

to offer one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer

the amendment which I send to the

desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk

will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after

line 20, it is proposed to insert the fol-

lowing:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General fund, construction: For continua-

tion of construction of the following project

in not to exceed the following amount, to be

expended from the general fund of the Treas-

ury in the same manner and for the same

objects as specified for projects in the In-

terior Department Appropriation Act, 1944,

under the caption, "Bureau of Reclamation," fiscal year 1944, to remain available until expended, and to be reimbursable under reclamation law:

Central Valley project, California, \$1,900,-000, which amount shall be available for the construction of the Shasta Dam-Oroville transmission line and terminal facilities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate that we expect to go into conference on the Interior Department appropriation bill at 3 o'clock this afternoon, and I am offering this amendment as a means of more quickly arriving at a conclusion or adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on that bill.

As the bill passed the Senate, in accordance with the action taken by the Senate a year ago in respect to this transmission line, if the Government of the United States is going to spend some \$300,000,000 for construction of a great reclamation project, to be paid for in large part by the sale of power, it was thought we should have more than one customer for the power. The only way to get more than one customer for the power is to be able to transmit the power down into the heart of California.

My own judgment is that in the end probably the great utility there, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., will be the purchaser of 85 or 90 percent of the power. Nevertheless, the Department of the Interior would be in a better bargaining position if it were able to transmit some power into the power market.

Mr. President, in the Interior Department appropriation bill the Senate adopted a provision in these identical words, but unfortunately a parliamentary situation developed in the House whereby the House had no opportunity to vote upon it as a separate, substantive proposition. If it can be voted on in connection with the pending bill, it will be taken out of the other bill as an issue. If not, we shall have much controversy with the House, and delay, until the House votes on the matter as a separate proposition. It seemed to me that procedure I have suggested would be the simplest way to dispose of the matter.

Mr. NYE. Will the Senator yield just long enough so that, as a member of the conference committee, I may express the hope that the Senate will give consent to the procedure the Senator has suggested?

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this matter should have an entirely different consideration from what will be given to it under the procedure proposed. This is a matter which has been before the Senate for 2 years. Last year the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate specifically wrote into the report a provision that the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Interior Department, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which is the public-service company of the State of California, should immediately, in the spirit of the war emergency, get together, and that a contract should be worked out so that the power which would be generated at Shasta Dam might be utilized as speedily as possible.

At that time it was considered that 225,000 kilowatts would be produced at Shasta Dam. Since that time the War Production Board has limited the production from the Shasta Reservoir to 150,000 kilowatts. Up to the present time no power has been generated at Shasta Dam. The record discloses, and it is practically undisputed, that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the public service company for the State of California, has tried time after time to negotiate a contract with the War Department in the spirit of the direction by the Congress of the United States. The record shows that the Interior Department has jumped back and forth, from one excuse to another. At no time was the contract entered into. In my judgment the contract might well have been entered into, and I speak now of my own judgment based on the record as made before the Appropriations Committee between the Interior Department and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a long time ago, and it should have been made a long time ago.

Provision is made in the bill that when power is generated at the Shasta Dam a 25-mile line shall be built to convey the power from the Shasta Dam to what is known as the Shasta substation. While the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able to construct the line from the Shasta substation to the Oroville substation, the Reclamation Bureau is determined to spend \$1,900,000 of the Government's money to build that line notwithstanding the fact that the Shasta substation and the Oroville substation, 75 miles apart, are both the property of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the only agency which has a transmission system which can utilize the power which is to be generated at the Shasta Dam.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able, and offers to take all the power which may be generated at the Shasta Dam, and the Interior Department engineers testified before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that the rates which are charged and the rates which are proposed to be charged by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the distribution of the Shasta power are as low as they could feasibly be made by the Interior Department were the Interior Department to be the distributing agency.

Mr. President, the House Appropriations Committee refused to appropriate the item of \$1,900,000 for the construction of this power line between the Shasta substation and the Oroville substation. The item is in conference, in dispute between the two Houses. Although the conference report has not been returned to the Senate for the Senate's approbation or rejection, now it is proposed to take the item out of the Interior Department appropriation bill, where it properly belongs, if it belongs anywhere, and to place it in the pending deficiency appropriation bill. Mr. President, I say in all fairness, that is not a fair way to deal with the question. The Senate committee has not studied the subject. It has not been presented as fully to the Senate as it should be. The

Senate should not now be called upon to vote upon an item of this kind, of such vital importance, in a deficiency appropriation bill, and I certainly shall oppose the proposal to the full extent of my ability.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have some recollection of the discussion of this matter in the committee, although it is far from clear in my mind. May I ask the Senator from Nevada, was not this matter under consideration in the last Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter was under consideration in a slightly different form, but the same principle was involved.

Mr. WHITE. The substance was the same?

Mr. McCARRAN. The same principle was involved. The matter was under consideration in the appropriation bill then current, the 1942-43 appropriation bill, and as a result the Appropriations Committee wrote a provision into the measure that the Interior Department and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. should immediately, because of the emergency, agree on a contract, and it was further provided that if any advantage should accrue to one of the contracting agencies arrangements should be entered into whereby the advantage should not continue in effect, and that recoupment should be made to the party disadvantaged.

Mr. WHITE. Was the matter considered before the Appropriations Committee when the Interior Department appropriation bill was prepared this year?

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter was again before the Appropriations Committee when the committee was considering the Interior Department appropriation bill. The matter was considered by the subcommittee. A voluminous record of evidence was taken as to why the contract called for by the Congress had not been executed, as to the merits of the item, as to whether or not the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was ready and willing to construct this line, as to how much power would be generated, as to who would handle the power—everything was gone into at length before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and the Senate adopted the item without any notice whatever being taken, although a vote was had on the item in the Appropriations Committee. The item was inserted in the bill by a vote of the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate voted to retain it in the bill. The House again refused to appropriate for the item.

Mr. WHITE. Do I correctly understand that the matter is now in conference between the two Houses?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is now in conference as an unsettled question between the House of Representatives and the Senate on the appropriation bill. Now when the matter is still in conference it is proposed to pick it out of the appropria-

tion bill, where it was considered by all concerned, and to place it in another and different bill.

Mr. WHITE. Is the amendment now offered recommended by the committee, or is it sponsored by the Senator from Arizona on his own responsibility?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this morning the Senate conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill held a meeting to consider what our action should be with respect to the conference we are to hold with conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. But the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has not authorized the offering of the amendment to this particular bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I wish to state that the conferees on the part of the Senate held a meeting this morning, realizing that if we could not get this controversial matter out of the conference report, it was very likely that the Interior Department bill would be tied up for a long time. Our difficulty is that when the vote was taken in the House on the proposal, it was not on the text which the Senate adopted. The motion was made in this way: There was a Budget estimate of \$24,000,000 for the Central Valley project; the proponents of the motion in the House proposed to reduce that to \$15,000,000, of which \$1,900,000 should be for the transmission line.

So far as I could learn, many Members of the House who were favorable to appropriating the full amount for the project might have been opposed to the present proposal, or they might have been favorable to it. However, when the amount to be appropriated for the entire project was reduced from \$24,000,000 to \$15,000,000, of course they would not agree to anything. So the matter is complicated in that way.

What we hope to do is to ask the House to vote separately on the item for the particular transmission line. So far as I am concerned, and I desire to be very frank, if the House of Representatives by majority of vote refuses to appropriate money for the transmission line we shall have to eliminate it from the pending deficiency bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May not the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill reach an agreement identical with the proposal the Senator now is advancing?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure they will not.

Mr. WHITE. Could they not do so if they saw fit?

Mr. HAYDEN. I suppose that by unanimous consent, which is not obtainable, the matter could be brought to a separate vote in the House. However, the parliamentary tangle in the other body makes it impossible to have this proposition considered in any manner on its merits, other than as the Senate conferees now request. I was instructed to offer the amendment on behalf of the conferees.



Let me say that I have no quarrel at all with the statement made by the Senator from Nevada with respect to the main facts. However, I disagree with him in this respect: There was very violent disagreement in the testimony before the committee as to who was responsible for the failure to come to an accord as Congress directed last year. The power company says it is the fault of the Secretary of the Interior. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior say it is the fault of the power company. I do not know whose the fault is.

We repeat our request in our committee report, urging them to get together if they can.

I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada a question, if I may. Does he concede that if nothing is done about the construction of the transmission line, there then will be but one purchaser for the power?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not any more than if the line is constructed. There is now only one purchaser for the power. That is conceded by everyone. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has all the distribution lines for the entire Central Valley region of California. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the only agency that can take the power when it is generated at the Shasta Dam.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, that is violently disputed by the Interior Department, who say that if they are permitted to take the power to central California they can find a number of purchasers for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator will concede that the Interior Department have not a single line with which to carry a kilowatt of the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. They never will have unless we appropriate the money.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are not proposing to do that now, but only to appropriate for a tie line between two substations.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It struck me as a rather extraordinary situation that there should be included in one appropriation bill an amendment substantially similar to this one, and then, because that appropriation bill has not made satisfactory progress either in the other body or in the conference, that a similar proposition should be inserted in a second appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me point out the situation. Suppose the Senate refuses to adopt the item now referred to. The item is still in the appropriation bill. Suppose the Senate agrees to the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona. The item is still in the appropriation bill. The conferees have no power to take the item out of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. We can take it out instantly if we want to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why do you not do so now?

Mr. HAYDEN. We want the House of Representatives to pass on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; the House of Representatives has on two occasions passed on the item. The House Appropriations Committee refused to submit the item to the House in the first instance. Secondly, when it went back the other day, the House voted on it; and this item was included in the motion made by the—

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the Senator another question. There was no vote in the House to insert the matter, when the bill was originally reported. The vote had a few days ago was to cut the amount from the \$24,000,000 authorized by the Bureau of the Budget to \$15,000,000, of which \$1,500,000 would be allowed for the transmission line. Those who wanted the full amount voted "no"—not against the transmission line, but against the amount of money proposed for the project. Unfortunately, that is the way it happened. The only way I know to handle the matter is to take the item out of the Interior Department appropriation and let the House vote on it separately as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to read from the report, if I may do so. Meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scruggs
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I challenge the right of the conference committee to take an item out of a bill submitted to it in conference and resubmit it to one of the Houses in connection with an entirely different bill on an entirely different subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Congress has passed a special act authorizing the construction of the Central Valley project, including power plants, transmission lines, irrigation works, and every other

phase, so this amendment is in order because it is authorized by law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been adopted by the Senate and is pending in conference. No matter what the Senate may do with this item now, it will still be in conference on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the conferees on the bill can recede at any time the conference committee is in session. The Chair further holds that the item is now in order on the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me long enough to offer an amendment which I think is of very great importance to every Senator. It will take only a moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. So long as I do not lose the floor, I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assure the Senator that he will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] may offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which is legislative in character. Probably it can be put in the bill only by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that it may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT  
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION: Upon the application within 60 days of any State or State board of vocational education, or county or county board of education, any building, accessory, equipment, tools, or machinery of any type heretofore in use by the National Youth Administration and located in such State and county shall be transferred by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to any such applicant without compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have just been conferring with Senators, and there seems to be another way by which the issue between the two Houses might be settled. Not very much can happen between now and the time when the Congress will reconvene after Labor Day, at which time the Department of the Interior can submit a budget estimate to Congress containing this text. There will

be a deficiency bill, on which that budget estimate will be in order. We can debate it, and it can be voted on in both Houses as a separate item. Under those circumstances I desire to withdraw my amendment and yield in the conference report, with the distinct understanding that the matter will be handled in that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senate will agree to that arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona is withdrawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

#### OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Office of War Information: The second paragraph under the caption "Office of War Information" contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not prevent the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, for insertion at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this an amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator identify the particular place in the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will have to be inserted in the proper place. May the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FISCAL YEAR 1944— WAR DEPARTMENT—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Military Establishment and for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year 1944 may be used for carrying into effect the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law —, 78th Cong.).

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this has just been sent down by the War Department. It seems on its face to be proper, but we will take it to conference and work it out there.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear what the Senator said. What is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. It permits settlement, by the authority of the Secretary

of War, of claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or for personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is there any limit on the claims?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. That is why I said I would take it to conference. There seems to be no limit as to the first paragraph of it. For that reason I concluded that I would ask only that it go to conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator will scrutinize it very carefully. It seems to me it would be a grave mistake to give unlimited authority for this purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what I thought about it and why I suggested that it be taken to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope the amendment will be agreed to because otherwise, as I understand, such claims, however meritorious they may be, have to be taken up by special bills. We would have a flood of relief bills to take care of such claims.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Louisiana has said, I venture to say, has become a reality with many of us in respect to claims of this nature now coming into our respective offices. I had assumed there was authority under the law to settle such claims up to a certain amount. Does the Senator know whether there is a law providing for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; there is such a law applying to amounts from \$500 to \$1,000.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, that is a small jurisdiction and limited authority. I quite agree that something of this nature should be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

United States Soldiers' Home: For an additional amount for the maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1944, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), \$80,820.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this request comes from the Soldiers' Home, and is presented by General Coleman, the Governor of the home. He submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has not sent in a formal estimate, but we had the testimony of General Coleman before us a short time ago, and I am quite sure a considerable saving can be made by granting this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Department of Agriculture, Federal crop insurance, administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 6, 1933, and as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501-1518; 55 Stat. as amended), fiscal year 1944, \$4,318,748, and the proviso contained under this caption in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1944 is hereby repealed.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, for days the Senate has listened to a discussion concerning the inability on the part of the Senate to obtain a fair reaction from the House of Representatives to the subject of crop insurance. I shall detain the Senate no longer than to invite attention to the fact that earlier in the day, when the crop-insurance item was under consideration, I gave notice of my intention to move as I have now moved. At that time the chairman of the Senate conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill indicated that he would urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that concludes the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3030) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the



amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 26, 30, and 31; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment, and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "sum not less than \$56,000,000 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of \$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience, in business, industry or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,091,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$33,222,504"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and not more than \$2,750,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch for the following functions only: Office of the Director, including book and magazine coordination sections; Office of Program Co-

ordination; News Bureau; Bureau of Special Services; Radio Bureau; Motion Picture Bureau, not exceeding \$50,000; and for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of organization units herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in organization units herewith reduced or eliminated, not exceeding \$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment before the word "within" insert the words "to the public"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$89,267,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$203,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments number 2, 11, 24, 25, 32, 33, and 34.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
M. E. TYDINGS,  
GERALD P. NYE,  
H. C. LODGE, JR.,  
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

CLARENCE CANNON,  
C. A. WOODRUM,  
LOUIS LUDLOW,  
J. BUELL SNYDER,  
EMMET O'NEAL,  
LOUIS C. RABAUT,  
JOHN TAHER,  
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,  
J. W. DITTER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2968 which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
July 3, 1943.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, and 32 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "executing" insert "general."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "\$13,359,600" and insert "\$10,500,000"; and in line 8 of said amendment strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$700,000"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to said bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 2 and 11.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 33 and 34, ask a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

#### CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 147.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

#### REORGANIZATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution proposing to amend the rules of the Senate by a reorganization of the committee structure of this body.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] was kind enough to place in the RECORD an article written by me for the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly. The proposed revision of the rules and reorganization of the committee structure is intended to carry out one of the suggestions I made in that article, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A3368.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 169) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out paragraph 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"Committee on Agriculture, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities, the establishment, maintenance, and control of credit facilities for farmers and farm cooperative organizations.

"Committee on Armed Forces, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the Military and Naval

Establishments, including the increase or reduction of commissioned officers and enlisted men, their pay, pensions, allowances, and benefits; to the development of land, air, and naval armaments, the militia, and the public defense.

"Committee on Finance and Monetary Affairs, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the raising of revenue and the bonded debt of the United States, the maintenance of the national currency, and the regulation of banking and credit.

"Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations.

"Committee on the Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the administration of all United States Territories and island possessions; the admission of States; relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes; the administration and transfer of public lands, public buildings, and occupied or improved grounds of the United States; the development and conservation of natural resources, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and flood control; construction and maintenance of roads and other public works; and the Postal Service.

"Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to patents, copyrights, and trade-marks, and the regulation of commerce among the several States.

"Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal law, and the maintenance of the courts and the civil liberties of citizens.

"Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to immigration and naturalization, wages and standards of labor, conditions of employment, collective bargaining between management and labor, social security and welfare, and the civil service.

"Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 24 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, to consist of 12 Senators, which shall as deemed necessary examine the accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, and commissions of the Government; the manner of keeping such accounts; the economy and justness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; and to which shall be referred all matters relating to the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; the economy and accountability of public officers; and the abolishment of useless offices.

"Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, to consist of 24 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters touching the rules and order of business of the Senate, the expenditure of the contingent fund of the Senate, printing, privileges and elections, the Library of Congress; and which committee shall be responsible for the proper enrollment of bills.

"Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 15 Senators.

"2. All standing committees shall have power to act jointly with the corresponding committee of the House of Representatives.

"3. No Senator shall at any time be a member of more than one standing committee other than the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the

Committee on the District of Columbia, or the Committee on Claims."

Resolved further, That paragraphs Nos. 2 and 3 shall be numbered 4 and 5, respectively.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the broad purposes of the proposed amendment to rule XXV are:

First. To increase the efficiency of the committee organization.

Second. To fix more definitely responsibility for primary formulation of legislative policy.

Third. To improve the machinery for legislative-executive cooperation on governmental policy and provide specialized and informed channels through which the Congress can exercise its policy-making function on a continuous and sustained basis.

In the interest of increased efficiency, the amendment would reduce the size of the substantive policy committees. The amendment provides that each of these committees shall have a membership of 12 Senators. It would limit each Senator to membership on only 1 such committee and thus concentrate his energies on the work of that 1 committee. It would empower joint action with corresponding committees of the House of Representatives.

To fix more precisely the responsibility for the formulation and guidance of legislative policy, it would outline the jurisdiction of each committee in the rule, regroup present duplicating jurisdictions scattered among many committees and reduce the total number of committees.

The fixing of primary legislative responsibility for each of the broad phases of governmental policy and the definite assignment of such responsibility to a given committee, would provide more clearly defined channels of contact and cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

The general effects of the amendment are as follows:

First. It would reduce the number of standing committees from the present 33 to 13.

Second. Of this number eight would constitute a group of substantive policy committees, five would constitute a group of more or less administrative function.

Third. The eight substantive policy committees would be: Agriculture; Armed Forces; Finance and Monetary Affairs; Foreign Relations; Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works; Interstate Commerce; Judiciary; Labor and Public Welfare.

Fourth. The five committees of administrative or executive function would be: Appropriations; Expenditures in Executive Departments; Rules and Administration of the Senate; Claims; District of Columbia.

Fifth. It would limit each Senator to membership on only one of the substantive policy committees.

Sixth. It would place no limitation on a Senator's privilege to serve on other committees.

Seventh. It would authorize all committees to act jointly with correspond-

ing committees of the House of Representatives.

In respect to specific committees, the noteworthy effects of the amendment would be:

First. To strike "Forestry" from name of Committee on Agriculture and leave the question of jurisdiction of agriculture over forestry to be determined as the occasion arises.

Second. To give the Committee on Agriculture clear authority to deal with matters of farm credit.

Third. To combine the present jurisdiction of Military and Naval Affairs Committees.

Fourth. To give the Committee on Armed Forces jurisdiction over matters affecting veterans of the armed forces.

Fifth. To combine related jurisdictions of present Finance and Banking and Currency Committees in one Committee on Finance and Monetary Affairs.

Sixth. To leave status of Foreign Relations Committee unchanged.

Seventh. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Territories and Insular Affairs, Indian Affairs, Public Lands and Surveys, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Inter-oceanic Canals under one Committee on Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.

Eighth. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Interstate Commerce, Manufactures, and Patents in one Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Ninth. To leave status of Committee on the Judiciary unchanged.

Tenth. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Education and Labor, Immigration, Civil Service, with present social security jurisdiction of Finance Committee under one Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Eleventh. To leave the status and size of Appropriations Committee unchanged.

Twelfth. To expand the membership of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments from the present number of 7 to 12.

Thirteenth. To combine the functions of the present Committees on Audit and Control of Contingent Expenditures, Rules, Printing, Enrolled Bills, Privileges and Elections, Library, under one Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, with an enlarged membership of 24.

Fourteenth. To leave unchanged the present rule on Committee on Claims and Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I have not served in this body for these many years without realizing the grave difficulties involved in any attempt to reorganize its committee structure, but I do say that, in the face of the enormous problems and the complex subject matter with which the Congress is now confronted, and with which it will be confronted in the post-war period, I think no person familiar with the situation in the Senate today can deny that there is a pressing need for committee reorganization and for the streamlining of the legislative branch of the Government if it is to survive in the



struggle for power which is bound to continue.

I realize that the moment it is suggested that one committee shall be combined with another immediately the question of the chairmanship is involved, and also other matters; but Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that there is no more important problem before the Congress of the United States than the question of trying to reorganize its procedure and to strengthen its committee structure in order that it may stand on a more equal footing with the executive arm of the Government.

I think no Senator who has served on many committees—and I am now as guilty as almost any other Senator with regard to the number of committees on which I try to serve—can help having noticed, especially during the last few months, and perhaps the last several years, the growing tendency of Senators to find it impossible to attend meetings of the important committees because of committee conflicts.

When I first entered this body one could turn to the Congressional Directory and find the meeting days of the important committees of the Senate. They met only on the days thus specified, and there was no conflict. Now, under the pressure of business and of the complexities of our economic society, the time has come when such committees meet almost continuously, and it is not at all unusual to have a Senator appear in a committee room—and I am not complaining about it—with at least four or five proxies in his pocket. That is not the way in which committees should function. I do not criticize Senators for the practice; under the present situation, it is inevitable. Hardly a day has gone by during the present long and arduous session of the Congress when I have not had to decide which one of the several very important committees I would attend on a particular day because of the nearly continuous work of the great committees of the Senate.

I say that if each Senator were confined to only one important committee it would be possible for him to attend its meetings. It would result in his becoming more expert upon the subject matter to which that committee would give its attention, and thus the work of the committees would be improved. In my judgment, we could discharge our responsibility with very much greater efficiency, and we would have committees more constantly in touch with the executive departments of the Government. Confronted as we are with the necessity of the delegation of large portions of legislative power to the executive arm of the Government, these committees would be in a position to make certain that the power was being exercised as the Congress intended it should be exercised.

Today, however, because the committee organization of the Senate has just grown, much like Topsy, executive departments cannot discharge their responsibility of keeping committees of Congress informed by merely going to one committee. Many of the departments have to go to a number of committees, and it has been demonstrated in

situations created by the war, when we have had several committees, each one with equal rights of jurisdiction, inquiring into the same subject matter at the same time.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. MALONEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Maine, then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHITE. In the Senator's suggestion, has he undertaken to deal with the question of quorums of the several committees, the question of proxies, and the question of polling committees? Those are matters which I think demand the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not attempted to deal with those questions. There is a rule touching the question of quorums. My proposal is merely suggestive in character. I submit it in all humility to the serious consideration of my colleagues. I do not claim that it is anything but a suggestion, but I do say in all seriousness that it is a matter of vital importance in the survival of representative government in our democracy.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the very last sentence of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and say that I share his opinion. I do not know that I would approve of his suggested plan in its entirety, but rather than do nothing about it, I would, on the basis of the explanation he has made, accept his plan without seeing it. He has wisely recognized the fact that as such a plan is considered, Senators would be confronted with the necessity of giving up chairmanships of important committees, and that that presents a kind of sacrifice. I have not been a Member of the Senate for so long a time as has the Senator from Wisconsin, but I have been here for a longer period of time than most Members of the Senate now on the floor, and so strongly feel the need for such a step that I would sacrifice whatever seniority positions I hold on committees and start over again on any or all of them. I am merely echoing the language and views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. President, as I say that I believe that we cannot much longer proceed with any hope of approaching perfection unless we make some such changes as the Senator outlines. I want to be among those to compliment and congratulate him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the generous, statesmanlike statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut concerning his willingness to sacrifice any privileges which he may enjoy under the present system is in keeping with his entire record of service as a Senator. I am sorry to say that I am not in a position to offer upon this altar of sacrifice some important chairmanship I might occupy, but I would be willing to yield up my membership on any committee if by making such a move I could help to bring

real consideration to this vital problem, which I believe confronts the Senate and the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as a part of my remarks a table which would show the effect on present jurisdiction over proposed legislation in the various committees were the rule I am suggesting to be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

The following table indicates the effect of the proposed amendment on the commonly accepted jurisdictions of the present standing committees of the Senate:

Present committee	Committee under amendment
Agriculture and Forestry.	Agriculture.
Appropriations.	Appropriations.
Audit and Control	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Contingent Expenses of the Senate.	
Banking and Currency.	Finance and Monetary Affairs.
Civil Service.	Labor and Public Welfare.
Claims.	Claims.
Commerce.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
District of Columbia.	District of Columbia.
Education and Labor.	Labor and Public Welfare.
Enrolled Bills.	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Expenditures in the Executive Departments.	Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Finance.	Finance and Monetary Affairs.
	Armed Forces (veterans' jurisdiction).
	Labor and Public Welfare (social security jurisdiction).
Foreign Relations.	Foreign Relations.
Immigration.	Labor and Public Welfare.
Indian Affairs.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
	Do.
Interoceanic Canals.	Interstate Commerce.
Interstate Commerce.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Irrigation and Reclamation.	Do.
Judiciary.	Judiciary.
Library.	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Manufactures.	Interstate Commerce.
Military Affairs.	Armed Forces.
Mines and Mining.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Naval Affairs.	Armed Forces.
Patents.	Interstate Commerce.
Pensions.	Armed Forces.
Post Offices and Post Roads.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Printing.	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Privileges and Elections.	Do.
Public Buildings and Grounds.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Public Lands and Surveys.	Do.
Rules.	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Territories and Insular Affairs.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.

#### VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA (REPT. NO. 398)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, from the Committee on Education and Labor, under Senate Resolution 266 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, extended by Senate Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, part V of the subcommittee's report entitled "The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935-39."

I wish to make a brief statement on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 of the

Seventy-fourth Congress, I have just submitted part V of the report on Employers' Association and Collective Bargaining in California, which is an analysis of the organization of resistance to collective bargaining in California, 1935 to 1939.

I also ask unanimous consent that a collection of excerpts from part V, constituting the introduction and the conclusions of this volume, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks at their conclusion. I do this so that the Members of the Senate may have a readily available outline of the subject matter treated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the volume submitted today is the fifth volume of a 10-volume report based upon this committee's final field investigation into undue interferences with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. The volume discusses the major developments in labor relations and the employers' association movement in California, following the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, as they concern organized employer interference with the rights of labor. It is a summary account of the inter-relationships of various movements and techniques which had as their purpose the curtailment of the exercise of labor's rights. The remaining parts of the report dealing in detail with particular phases will be submitted as they become available.

The Members of the Senate who were here during the last term of Congress will recall that the senior Senator from Utah and I introduced a bill called the Oppressive Labor Practices Act. This act would have proscribed as criminal offenses labor espionage, professional strike-breaking, the use of industrial munitions, certain abuses of private police systems, antiunion vigilantism, blacklisting, employer agreements to refrain from collective bargaining, so-called yellow-dog practices, organized employer coercion of employers or employees to prevent them from practicing collective bargaining, and conspiratorial action by employers and employers' associations to carry on these practices. The report submitted here today renews our committee's recommendation of this type of legislation and provides a convincing case history of the national necessity for striking down by national act not only oppressive labor practices but its organized and conspiratorial culmination.

No Member of Congress would have to go beyond the pages of the report submitted today to find complete and adequate reasons for the adoption of the legislative recommendation which this committee has urged. The national policy for collective bargaining will never be secure in California or elsewhere so long as the belligerent employers' associations of the sort revealed in this report, can carry on the practices outlined in the Oppressive Labor Practices Act without fear of severe sanctions. This report makes it clear for all who

would read that this is not a theory but a fact.

Such legislation as that recommended and proven as necessary in the report submitted today is long overdue. Some of the practices described have been sharply condemned by various congressional investigating committees for nearly half a century. As the 12 reports of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor under Senate Resolution 266 disclose in overwhelming detail, they have continued in recent years to be a substantial interference with the progress of industrial democracy. No one who is familiar with the 80 volumes of record of the committee's investigation, which includes 30,000 pages of public testimony and exhibits, can gainsay that fact.

These oppressive labor practices constitute invasions of civil rights by predatory interests that cannot be condoned even by the boldest spokesman for brutality and industrial autocracy. They have been uniformly condemned as pernicious activities by all who presume any knowledge of industrial relations and public morals. The Senate itself concurred in this opinion when it passed the forerunner of the bill recommended here in 1940.

For decade after decade similar proposals to outlaw these practices have been presented to the Congress. They have failed of passage not because of any criticism of their merits but because the legislature was too easily diverted as the more spectacular revelations of these sordid activities grew cold in the public mind. Now that we are for the time being in an era of comparative industrial peace due to the single-minded devotion of the vast majority of employers and employees to the job of winning the war, we should not forget these manifestations of evil that will surely poison the stream of industrial labor relations and thwart the rights of labor when we return to normal peacetime relationships. We should seize the first opportunity to strike down these oppressive labor practices and write "finis" to a long and bitter chapter of American history.

Certain groups in Congress seem to be in a mood to legislate concerning labor. It is important that Congress move to reassure the men and women who labor that their organizations and their efforts to exercise their rights and better their economic position will be preserved from private attack and aggression from this day forward. Now, as last year, I believe that labor should be assured that the Nation is not going to yield to those forces in Congress and out who have been seeking to subvert, eliminate, or substantially weaken the national guaranty of collective bargaining.

The present emergency is the occasion used by antilabor groups to deprive labor of its rights. There was a day when it was considered popular and statesmanlike to legislate for the protection of labor's rights. Now the winds that blow through the mail, over the telegraph, over the radio, and in the great newspaper organs have created in some

minds a contrary impression. I say that unless we in the Congress have the intestinal fortitude in this time of peril and crisis to defend and promote the institutions and doctrines that symbolize our democracy, we will be guilty of losing the war on the home front. If we continue to indicate that it is our intention or design to refuse protection to the growth of bona fide trade-unionism and industrial democracy, we deprive the Nation of one of its greatest sources of internal and spiritual strength—a feeling on the part of workmen that they are truly defending a democracy.

The legislative recommendation contained in this report should be adopted now as a substantial measure of protection to that form of democratic society we are dedicated to preserve. Such an act would symbolize as nothing else the stake of millions upon millions of men and women of labor in the democracy we are striving to defend from totalitarian aggression. At a time when labor is being urged or compelled by public pressure to give up its right to strike, when its wages are frozen by directive, when the living standards of the families represented are seriously threatened by increased living costs, when it is tied to its job by governmental order, when it is subject to continued vilification and abuse by those who knowingly or unknowingly would destroy our precious unity, labor needs an assurance of its place in the industrialized society of the future.

Favorable action on the legislation recommended would serve as a basic foundation for our post-war labor policy. Let us not deceive ourselves that industrial democracy is so soundly rooted in the hearts and minds of 100 percent of the employers of this Nation that it needs no legal charter. True, we have made great strides in the last decade. But, history will show that after the First World War the advocates of industrial absolutism took advantage of the economic stringencies and reaction that followed to attack the trade-union movement with every weapon in the arsenal of organized antiunionism. Trade unions were all but destroyed as a vital functioning institution. These same groups refused to accept section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act; they fought the adoption of the N. L. R. A. and violated it with impunity; there are still large areas of employment in many parts of the Nation to which collective bargaining has not yet extended. We can be sure that without such a law as the act proposed, the forces of industrial autocracy, individual and collective, inhibited only by the gentle administrative restraints of the National Labor Relations Act, will continue to seize upon the post-war period to turn back the march of industrial democracy and return to industrial absolutism in industry upon industry, State after State. The heinous practices that this recommendation would make criminal offenses against the United States are the main weapons by which this warfare against unions would be waged.



I expect to continue to urge the legislation recommended in this report until it is placed upon the statute books. I expect to seek to amend any legislation that comes on the floor of this body dealing with our permanent national labor policy to include the measure recommended.

#### EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM PART V OF A REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE ORGANIZATION OF RESISTANCE TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA (1935-39)

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong., 2d sess.),<sup>1</sup> the committee herein submits a general analysis of a program of conspiratorial interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, conducted by powerful employers' associations in California in the years 1935 to 1939, inclusive. This is part V of a report consisting of the following 10 parts:

Part I. General Introduction.

Part II. Organized Antiunionism in California Industry Prior to the Passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Part III. The Disadvantaged Status of Unorganized Labor in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part IV. Employers' Associations and Their Labor Policies in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part V. The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935-39.

Part VI. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the Los Angeles Area, 1935-39.

Part VII. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1935-39.

Part VIII. The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.—Its Reorganization, Policies, and Significance, 1935-39.

Part IX. The Origin and Promotion of Recent Legislation in California Limiting Labor's Civil Rights.

Part X. Conclusions and Recommendations.

The scope and background of the investigation upon which this and other parts of the report are based are described in part I, which constitutes a general introduction. As indicated, in the three preceding parts of this report the committee discussed the past history and importance in employer-employee relationships of urban employers' associations in the two metropolitan centers, San Francisco and Los Angeles; the structure and problems of California agriculture; and the origin, function, and labor policies of associations of agricultural employers in California. This part discusses the major developments in labor relations and the employers' association movement in California in recent years, when the overshadowing factors were an invigorated trade-union movement and the National Labor Relations Act. This and subsequent parts of the report constitute a comprehensive study of the response in an important economic region of the United States to the fundamental change in national policy represented by the National Labor Relations Act.

<sup>1</sup> A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was appointed by the chairman June 6, 1936, under S. Res. 266 which reads in part as follows: "Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation of violations of the right of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively." The limit of expenditures under this resolution was extended by various resolutions in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congs.

In this region the committee uncovered a sustained and complex program of organized resistance on the part of leading industrial and financial elements among employers' organizations to the policy of the act and to the organizations of employees which invoked its protection.

The story in California is one of great complexity. It involves all the organizations which have been discussed in preceding parts of the report and unfolds against the background of those basic economic problems, principally in agriculture, which have been examined there. Traditional attitudes and old devices were employed by the employers' organizations to forestall the unionization of their employees or render their unions ineffectual. At the same time, new circumstances called for the development of new techniques and, in some cases, compelled a shift from the old tradition of refusing to bargain collectively. Typically, this new development required a highly organized campaign to consolidate various groups of employers and the general public into ever-increasing pyramids of powerful opposition to a realistic effectuation of the national labor policy.

Typically, the story has three principal divisions: the activities of employers' associations in San Francisco, the activities of employers' associations in Los Angeles, and the activities of employer groups and the Associated Farmers in agriculture. In none of these three spheres, however, did the action proceed independently. The most important movements affected the region as a whole, and the employers' associations throughout the period sought for State-wide and coast-wide unity of purpose and action. Out of the highly developed integration between industry and agriculture, a close relationship between the activities of widely separated employer groups resulted.<sup>2</sup> In certain instances, notably in the legislative sphere, the old antiunion employers' associations and the new—urban and agricultural—combined all their efforts to curb the rising tide of unionism.

Chronologically, the period falls into two parts. The first dates from the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in July 1935 to the Supreme Court decisions in April 1937 holding it constitutional. During this time the long-existent antiunion associations, heretofore described in part II and part IV, practically ignored the law as a restraint. But they were acutely affected by the struggles of employees, encouraged by its passage, to secure the benefits it promised. Against these efforts to organize, they utilized the old devices of repression wherever they were practicable. In many situations they found them less and less adequate to their needs.

The second period follows the Supreme Court decisions upholding the act. Almost at once the antiunion employer groups

<sup>2</sup> This type of relationship has been discussed in previous parts of this report. For the industrial interest in California agriculture, see part III, pp. 388-393. See also part IV for the following: Structure and control of "area" and "commodity" employers' associations, pp. 417-418; Western Growers Protective Association, pp. 438-468; Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, Inc., pp. 468-490; Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc., pp. 498-522; Farm Labor Service of Arizona, pp. 522-537; associations in the citrus industry, pp. 538-553; California Processors and Growers, Inc., an association in the canning industry, pp. 554-572; promotion, organization, financing, and control of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., pp. 573-616; origin and policy of the Agricultural Producers' Labor Committee, pp. 639-640; organizational framework of the California State Chamber of Commerce, pp. 650-651.

sought to organize some semblance of support for their policies from nonindustrial groups, such as organizations of citizens, women, farmers, or the general public. Without that support they felt helpless before the law. With it they might defy, evade, or counteract the law and its inherent public policy with varying degrees of impunity. To secure this support they subsidized or created organizations among these groups, always concealing their own participation, and turned to the resources of modern public-relations experts. To some extent, they also fostered employee organizations opposed to the standard nationally affiliated labor unions. Traces of this so-called third-party technique may be found, it is true, prior to 1937, particularly in such creations as the Citizens' Association of the Salinas Valley<sup>3</sup> and in some of the aspects of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc.<sup>4</sup> But it was only after the National Labor Relations Act had been upheld that such practices commanded the universal and whole-hearted support of the leaders of the antiunion movement throughout the State.

Naturally, such attempts to secure the support of groups not directly related to the issue of collective bargaining in industry had a broad political aspect. As early as the fall of 1938 the leading elements in the employers' association movement sought by every possible method of propaganda to induce the general public to vote drastic legislative restrictions upon the activities of labor unions. The attempt was made then in all three Coastal States but succeeded only in Oregon.<sup>5</sup>

Repeated attempts have followed. Finally, in the spring of 1941, long after this committee's investigation had been concluded, the California State Legislature, over the veto of Gov. Culbert Olson, passed a law prohibiting the use of the secondary boycott. The enforcement of this act was suspended and made subject to a recent public referendum in accordance with procedure under the California legal system. It was approved in the fall elections of 1942 by a close vote. The end of that trend is not in sight. Current legislative proposals concerning labor unions in both the National and State spheres indicate that it is only beginning. Hence, it is important that its genesis and significance in at least one State be fully appreciated because of its bearing upon our national labor policy.

The importance of industrialized agriculture in the economy of California<sup>6</sup> adds a factor to the pattern of labor relations there during this period which has not been remarked by the committee in its studies elsewhere. Since the National Labor Relations Act expressly exempts "agricultural laborers," one of California's most important groups of wage earners was not affected substantially by the Federal guaranty of collective bargaining. The mere existence of such a large body of unprotected wage earners engaged in the production of commodities which move in interstate commerce, side by side with those who found their rights protected by the Federal Government, presents a serious problem. Few have ever contended that the conditions of employment in agriculture do not bear some of the same characteristics as those which stimulated union organization in industry, and there finally won acceptance for

<sup>3</sup> For the discussion of the role played by the Citizens' Association of the Salinas Valley in the Salinas strike of 1936, see part VIII of this report, sec. 3, ch. 2, subsecs. A-2 and B-4.

<sup>4</sup> For a résumé of the activities of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., in 1934-35, see part IV of this report, pp. 617-636. The period 1936-39 is treated in part VIII.

<sup>5</sup> See part IX of this report, sec. 2, ch. 6.

<sup>6</sup> See pt. II of this report, pp. 67-69; see also pt. III.

the process of collective bargaining. In California at least, the sweeping agricultural exemption in the National Labor Relations Act seemed, from the workers' point of view, an arbitrary inconsistency. In turn, it rendered highly unsettled the entire range of employer-employee relationships in both industry and agriculture.

Aside from the apparent injustice of the exemption, it provided a refuge and base of operations for that philosophy of hostility to unionism which had for so long animated the belligerent employers' associations in California. Many of the largest employers and industrial interests in the State had both industrial and agricultural employees. Toward the former, the National Labor Relations Act required an attitude of fair dealing and recognition; toward the latter, the same employer could direct, without restraint, all those devices of antiunionism which had become traditional in so-called open-shop circles. The war against unions in agriculture was carried on as ruthlessly as ever, but now it assumed a new significance for the city unions. Employer mechanisms, set up ostensibly to fight the agricultural union but inspired by interests which straddled both industry and agriculture, began an attack through publicity, propaganda, threats of economic pressure, and outright strikebreaking tactics upon the spread of urban unionism.<sup>7</sup> The symbol of the embattled farmer was created by certain industrial interests to mask attacks, inconsistent with the policy of the National Labor Relations Act, on trade-unionism. In short, the limited coverage of the National Labor Relations Act through the exemption of agricultural labor became a serious threat to its successful application in its own limited sphere.

That situation, now apparent in the analysis of labor relations in a single State has great meaning for a nation in which great sections and regions are still predominantly agricultural. Indeed, the whole destiny of the national labor policy may be resolved by the attitudes of areas dominated by agricultural populations, as reflected in national legislation and along the picket line. The action of both organized and incipient antiunionism in this sphere will become increasingly significant.

This, in general, is the scope of part V and the succeeding parts of the report. The parts to follow will treat Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the agricultural developments separately and generally, in chronological fashion. At the outset, however, it is important to emphasize that it is the committee's objective to present the picture of this economic region as a whole, particularly as it concerns the reaction of its leading employer groups to the principles of collective bargaining as embodied in the National Labor Relations Act between the date of its passage and the year 1940, when our normal national trends were arranged more and more in the perspective of national defense. For that purpose, part V will draw only the broad outlines of a picture which will be presented in detail in the parts following. It will stress the relationship between the major developments, offering only a summary analysis of events for the region and the period. This treatment will necessarily

be chronological and dynamic, leaving an analytical examination of the record and the evidence to the subsequent parts.

A bird's-eye view of the period reveals certain lines of force around which the pattern of events is arranged. Without an understanding of the development of the union organizing movement and the direction it followed, the period is, of course, unintelligible. In a region where the dominant employer groups were opposed to the very concept of unionization, the unions necessarily had to be built one upon the other, each finding the support of another in some industry related to its own, and in turn reaching out to stimulate and encourage the organization of employees in some other industry yet unorganized. Isolated and alone, few if any of the unions felt certain of survival in an atmosphere dominated by the antiunion attitudes of powerful employers' associations.

Reciprocal sympathetic action among unions is observable in other parts of the country, but the unusual intensity which it attained in California is attributable at least in part to the long dominance of the local or regional antiunion employers' associations. It has been pointed out in Part II of this report that the inclusive antiunion employers' association has a long history in California, and has shaped labor relations in that State almost from its beginnings. This history demonstrated that a single union in a single industry could easily fall prey to a hostile employers' association capable of turning the massed economic strength of an entire community against it. Employers engaged in collective bargaining might be compelled, even against their own interest, by the economic and social coercion which such an association could exert, to disrupt or avoid successful union relations and join the massed ranks of antiunionism. If employers with whom the unions secured collective-bargaining relations retained their membership in associations so avowedly hostile to unionism, it was natural for the unions to assume that their declarations of good will were not to be trusted. Under such circumstances, it is unrealistic to regard the support which the unions gave each other as capricious or misguided sympathetic action. Rather, it was conduct they felt to be necessary if their struggle against the antiunion employers' associations for the permanent enjoyment of their rights was to be successful.

The origin of this interlocking process of union organization lay in unions of certain types of transportation workers. Of these, the waterfront and teamsters' unions were the most important. It has already been noted that in the San Francisco strike of 1934 the longshoremen's union refused to return to work until the demands of all of the other marine unions were met.<sup>8</sup> Following 1934, the longshoremen lent their aid to the organizing of warehousemen. Other city unions, in such businesses as the food markets, retail stores and the like, readily followed. The longshoremen and warehousemen then went back a step further from the waterfront to the employees of the mills, factories, and food processing plants whose products passed ultimately through the warehouses to the port. In this strategy the truck drivers were of the greatest importance, constituting a vital link in the union structure and reaching back from the port or railhead even into the fields. In San Francisco in 1934 the truck drivers, enrolled in the Teamsters' Union, supported the longshoremen, thus assuring the success of the strike; in Los Angeles in 1936 the longshoremen supported the teamsters, thereby launching the first powerful union organization in that citadel of antiunionism.

<sup>8</sup> See pt. II of this report, p. 121.

The support which these unions gave to one another, as they reached back along the lines of processing and handling to the point of production, was far from negligible. For example, if the warehousemen struck in a contest with their own employers, the longshoremen might refuse to handle goods from the warehouses on strike, teamsters might refuse to load goods from such warehouses, sailors to man the ships in which they were placed. Conversely, warehousemen or mill employees might refuse to accept goods from trucks operated by strikebreaking truck drivers. A solid union front at one point in the process of marketing made it extremely difficult for employers nearer the raw materials to maintain an antiunion policy. The justification for this boycott technique was the general hostility of the dominant employer groups, acting in concert, toward unionism. The danger of the technique was the ease with which it could be applied. At the outset, however, before the National Labor Relations Act was recognized as valid, it is doubtful indeed whether the organization of employees could have been extended beyond the water front if this form of boycott had not been frequently applied. Even now, the on-the-ground organization of agricultural workers in the atmosphere of organized antiunionism that marks many of California's rural areas may continue to be relatively impossible if sympathetic tactics are barred and the exemption of agricultural workers from national protection is continued. Hence, the various political battles that have raged over the tactics of secondary boycott and "hot cargo" (refusal to handle goods processed, cultivated, or previously handled by employers deemed unfair to labor) involve, among other issues, the effort of organized antiunionism in California's agricultural industry to free itself from any possible restraint inherent in this sympathetic action by urban unions.

The unions, of course, have lent other aid to each other. Acting together in local trade-union councils, through State federations and the great internationals, voting funds for organization drives, and sending organizers to the unorganized, the California locals built up unions throughout industry. The boycott technique was but one of many devices used for the support of employees struggling to obtain collective bargaining, but it was the device most hated and feared by the employers, and most publicized.

As this pattern of organizing from the waterfront back into industry became apparent, it came to be designated in hostile quarters as the "March Inland." This dramatic term emphasized the fact that beyond the packing and processing plants, which felt the stirrings of organization in 1936, lay the land, with its thousands of miserable and underpaid agricultural workers. Here was a field from which organization had been excluded by vigilantism and terror after the violent strikes of 1933. Unaided and alone, the agricultural workers, who lacked funds, permanent homes, community life, and continuity of employment, were not likely to be able to form strong trade-unions and exercise their collective-bargaining rights. With the support of powerful and well-financed unions in the transportation and processing industries, however, successful unions of agricultural workers were not inconceivable. Certainly, their union funds would have to be supplied by established unions in industry. This fact found recognition in the efforts of the California State Federation of Labor in 1936 to finance an organizing drive in agriculture,<sup>9</sup> and may be observed today in the structure of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, whose processing and

<sup>9</sup> See statement of Edward Vandeleur, pt. 60, p. 22057.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of industry's role in reviving the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1; for the background of the farmers' boycott against San Francisco, see pt. VIII, sec. 3, ch. 6, subsec. H; for a discussion of the Farmers' Transportation Association formed to prevent the spread of the teamsters' union organizing drive in southern California, see pt. VIII, sec. 4, ch. 5; for an account of the activities of the Associated Farmers in aiding the processing industry during the Stockton cannery strike of 1937, see pt. VIII, sec. 3, ch. 3.



packing locals necessarily finance the attempts to organize the field workers.

The boycott threat to "unfair" employers could be an even more powerful measure of support than financial aid. No widespread boycott of agricultural products has ever been attempted by the urban unions of California, but the fear of it runs as an undercurrent in the thinking of the closely knit antiunion organizations of the State. Indeed, it may be suggested that undue concentrations on this potential threat led the employers' associations to seize upon it themselves, and to apply it in reverse, stimulating the agricultural producers to threaten a boycott of their urban customers as a penalty for not curbing the spread of unionism.

Such, in general, was the pattern of the union organizing campaign in the period under discussion, 1935-39. Against this pattern, it is easier to clarify the major developments in the employers' association movement.

The employers' associations naturally concentrated their opposition upon the dynamic points of stimulus and strength to the union movement, namely, the longshoremen in San Francisco and the teamsters in Los Angeles. Beginning early in 1935, the Waterfront Employers Association of San Francisco and the Industrial Association of San Francisco sought to discover some means of curbing and ultimately destroying the power of the water-front unions. Gradually a grandiose scheme of locking out longshoremen in all the principal ports of the Pacific coast was evolved. Conferences with this end in view were held among the representatives of the leading employers' associations in the coast ports. Failure to secure unity among the shipping lines prevented this scheme from being realized, but it was the underlying element in the plans of the employers' association movement until the water-front strike, which began on October 28, 1936, and ended on February 4, 1937.<sup>10</sup>

While the employers' associations were thus laying plans for destroying the power of the longshoremen's union through a sheer test of strength, the union sought to fortify itself by reaching out into the warehouse and processing industries. This organizing campaign affected those agricultural interests which owned both warehouses and processing plants.

Beginning in 1936, the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., was reorganized as the union drive swung into this new sphere.<sup>11</sup> The motive for this reorganization was ostensibly related to the possibility of a renewed union effort among agricultural workers. But it is notable that the driving force behind the reorganization was the California Packing Corporation, whose terminals and warehouses were at that time feeling the effects of the organizing efforts of the longshoremen and warehousemen and the employer groups affiliated with the old industrial association, which was dedicated to blocking the rising tide of unionism. The Associated Farmers was not reorganized by the dirt farmers nor by the great agricultural employers' associations which have been delineated and described in part IV. It was reorganized under the impetus of officials of the California Packing Corporation after it had been kept alive through the summer and fall of 1935 by financial subsidies from the Industrial Association of San Francisco. It was not until later that the Associated Farmers was able to enlist the support of the

agricultural employers' associations. It has never succeeded in getting a broad mass support from the smaller farmers of California. These circumstances surrounding the reorganization of the Associated Farmers point to the conclusion that it was reorganized in the interest of the industrial employers to serve as an auxiliary in their anticipated contest with a growing trade-unionism which was then being inspired by the gains of water-front unions and the broad response of all labor to the guarantees of the National Labor Relations Act. The later activities of the Associated Farmers add considerable support to this thesis.

This conclusion is further borne out by the history of the employers' association movement in southern California during these years. There the Merchants and Manufacturers Association was reorganized in 1936 in an effort to stem the organizing drive of the Teamsters Union.<sup>12</sup> Finding the traditional methods of opposition comparatively ineffective in 1936 and 1937, the Los Angeles employers' associations then turned to the Associated Farmers, pouring money into its coffers and enlisting its support and the support of allied farm groups against the organization of the truckers of southern California. Here again the urban employers' associations established and maintained this purported farmers' organization as an auxiliary in their own conflict.<sup>13</sup>

Although organized from above and supported financially by industrial or semi-industrial interests, the Associated Farmers nevertheless made a definite appeal to the agriculturists of California, which group included many individuals or enterprises actually participating in or closely associated with various forms of urban industry. By magnifying the possibility that the march inland would result in the organization of agricultural workers and by playing upon a traditional fear of this possibility among California agriculturists, the Associated Farmers' movement managed to secure a considerable degree of local agrarian support. This support is captured by taking an aggressive leadership whenever strikes or organizing drives were threatened in specific rural localities.<sup>14</sup> The utility of such aggressive employer leadership in local strikes was readily perceived by the agricultural employers' associations. They lent their financial aid to the State organization of the Associated Farmers, and assisted and supported the formation of local units among the smaller farmers. Mere skeleton committees for most of the time, the county units of the Associated Farmers blossomed into activity and increased their membership whenever the organization of agricultural employees threatened. Similarly, at the instigation of the processors and packers, or their associations, they assumed a strikebreaking and vigilante role with respect to the organization of can-

ning and processing employees.<sup>15</sup> The State organization, the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., was responsible for the formation of the local county units. It provided the leadership, gave direction to local policy, and lent expert advice and assistance according to prescribed union-breaking tactics whenever there was local trouble. But there was a wide difference between these local units of the Associated Farmers and the State-wide organization, whose functions also included public relations, legislative pressure, and the coordination of local policy with the larger sphere of interest. The State organization had the further duty of securing finances, which it did from the industrial interests and, later, increasingly from the agricultural employer's associations, representing the real parties in interest in most of the important struggles against the organization of field and processing labor.<sup>16</sup>

As the unions grew in numbers, the employers' associations began to see the need of wider public support. The public-relations theme was first stressed at a conference of leading west coast employers and employers' association executives held in February 1936 at Del Monte, Calif., under the auspices of the National Association of Manufacturers.<sup>17</sup> Favorable public opinion meant not only support for the employers' associations in their respective measures, but also added strength for their attempt to curb unionism through State and local legislation. The State organization of the Associated Farmers was a device characteristic of this new trend.<sup>18</sup> It represented itself as a mass organization of farmers opposing the unionization of agricultural laborers, the fixing of minimum wages for agricultural labor, the building of housing by Federal Government agencies for agricultural workers, and governmental intervention in the regulation of labor supply. In its legislative activities, however, the organization represented the farmers in name only. As has been observed, the local units had little real membership, and stirred into activity only when strikes threatened their respective localities. The entire legislative policy and the propaganda which surrounded it lay completely in the hands of the leaders of the State organization, working in close harmony with the industrial leaders. Among the various puppet organizations which the employers' associations set up to sway public and legislative opinion, the Associated Farmers alone was State-wide in scope. Other groups, serving a local antiunion function and having repressive legislative objectives at Sacramento, were set up on a regional or local basis.

The most spectacular use of this technique on a purely local scale occurred in the Los Angeles area following the success of the teamsters' union in 1937 and the validation of the National Labor Relations Act. The Merchants and Manufacturers Associa-

<sup>10</sup> For an account of the reorganization of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association and the event leading up to it, see pt. VI of this report, sec. 1, ch. 1.

<sup>11</sup> See pt. VIII of this report, sec. 4, chs. 3, 4, and 5, for an account of the role of the Associated Farmers in the campaign against the Teamsters' Union, in southern California.

<sup>12</sup> See pt. VIII of this report for the following: Associated Farmers of Contra Costa County and the organized prevention of employee association, sec. 3, ch. 1; Salinas lettuce packers' strike of 1936, sec. 3, ch. 2, subsecs. A-3 and B-4; Stockton cannery strike of 1937, sec. 3, ch. 3, subsec. B-4; Associated Farmers of Stanislaus County, sec. 3, ch. 4; Associated Farmers of Yolo County and the apricot pickers' strike of 1937, sec. 3, ch. 5; Associated Farmers of Sutter and Yuba Counties—the Marysville strike of 1939, sec. 3, ch. 7; Associated Farmers of the lower San Joaquin Valley and the Madera County cotton strike of 1939, sec. 3, ch. 8, subsec. D.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of the relationship between the Associated Farmers and the California Processors & Growers, Inc., and the strikebreaking and vigilante tactics pursued by the Associated Farmers of San Joaquin County during the Stockton cannery strike in April 1937, see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 3, ch. 3.

<sup>14</sup> For an account of the financing of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., and the reasons which motivated various groups to contribute to the organization, see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1, ch. 1.

<sup>15</sup> This Pacific Coast Economic Conference is discussed in ch. 3 of sec. 1 of this part V of the report, pp. 724-733.

<sup>16</sup> The State legislative activities of the Associated Farmers are discussed in part VIII of this report, sec. 2, ch. 4. The part played by the State organization and its county units in securing the adoption of local anti-picketing ordinances is described in part IX, sec. 1.

<sup>10</sup> For an analysis of the events leading up to the coast-wide water-front strike of 1936-37 and an account of the strike, see chs. IV and V of the memorandum, pt. 76, pp. 27867-27926; for a briefer account, see pt. VII, sec. 1, ch. 3.

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of the reorganization of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1.

tion, long the "fighting tool" of the Los Angeles open-shop movement, became only one of a galaxy of organizations. A new streamlined organization, euphronically termed Southern Californians, Inc.,<sup>10</sup> became the holding company and directing genius of the Neutral Thousands,<sup>11</sup> its successor, the Employees Advisory Service,<sup>12</sup> and the Farmers' Transportation Association,<sup>13</sup> as well as the Merchants and Manufacturers Association and its ancillary trade groups. Employers, employees, consumers, farmers, and the general public were taught the antiunion gospel by the appropriate organization. But propaganda was not the end, only the beginning. It was designed to create an attitude of mind that permitted varying types of interference with union organization and collective bargaining. Old-style devices were combined with new strategies to defeat unionism. There was company-union promotion on a mass scale, far-reaching and novel solidification of allied employer groups, the enactment of local laws restricting ordinary union activity, unusual levels of cooperation with local law-enforcement officials, and an intensive cultivation of "community" opinion on behalf of the "open shop."

The organized employer groups in San Francisco became less concerned with obstructing any semblance of collective bargaining by employers with their employees. Their objective became rather a tightened coordination of employer groups for the use of "pressure tactics" within the framework of collective bargaining that would preserve substantially their economic advantage.

All of these employer groups in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the rural areas found that the promotion of political action favorable to their position and adverse to trade-unionism was an attractive sphere of joint action. Regardless of the degree of observance or lip service paid to the national labor policy, these powerful organized groups were disposed to shackle the trade-union movement by law in some fashion. The great campaign to enact proposition No. 1, the anti-union initiative of 1938, was a climax of this combined effort.

These, in general, are the lines of development which featured the antiunion activities of organized employer groups during the period 1935-39.

#### CONCLUSION

The period 1935-39, taken as a whole, reveals a totally unnecessary amount of conflict and strife in labor relations in California. It is true, of course, that any period marked by so rapid an increase in union organization and the adjustment of employers to the practice of collective bargaining will show considerable friction, minor clashes, and excesses on both sides. Nevertheless, California dis-

played not only these minor disturbances of a healthy and changing social organism, but also a deeply implanted pathological condition. The root of the malady was organized antiunionism, finding expression in the all-inclusive antiunion employers' association. To condemn such associations is not a reflection upon other types of socially useful employers' organizations, nor an attack upon the constitutional rights which employers share with all other members of the body politic to associate together for their mutual interest. It is merely a recognition of an institutional abuse which society must curb. The all-inclusive antiunion employers' association finds no counterpart on the labor side. No one has ever discovered an association of workmen formed for the express and avowed purpose of denying to their employers enjoyment of the right to organize and associate together for economic purposes. Such an organization of workers is inconceivable, and yet exactly the same concept among employers has long been a recognized reality. In California the antiunion associations achieved greater influence than is common, and have lingered longer as a dangerous and disturbing factor in labor relations.

In the preceding discussion, the outstanding instruments of organized antiunionism have been identified and the strategy and tactics of their activities in opposing union organization and collective bargaining during the 5-year period (1935-39, inclusive) have been outlined. It is a sad commentary upon our industrial democracy that since the adoption in 1935 of a national labor policy favoring collective bargaining, California employers have pooled millions of dollars to finance organized and systematic interference with the civil liberties of labor.

In exhibit B of the appendix, six of these major organizations have been listed with their income for this 5-year period.<sup>1</sup> These organizations include the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Los Angeles; Southern Californians, Inc.; the Industrial Association of San Francisco; the Associated Farmers of California, Inc.; and its county units; the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California; and the Committee for Peace in Employment Relations.

Scattered throughout the succeeding parts of the report, which treat their operations in detail, there are references to additional funds collected for the purpose of obstructing the growth of unionism and collective bargaining. A grand total of the income of all employers' associations in California would far exceed the total of \$3,272,048 which is charged to the six major organizations listed for the period 1935-39, inclusive. While these organizations may boast of functions other than the governance of employer-employee relationships according to the precepts of antiunionism, that major activity colored their entire operations.

Of course, these organizations were but the creature of the corporations, business houses, and individuals that financed them. While some of these contributors assumed the more active roles in the work of a particular belligerent employers' association, none who contributed with a knowledge of its purpose and activities can escape the joint responsibility for its maintenance.

In exhibit C of the appendix, there is a list of responsible business firms whose contributions largely have made possible the operations of these major belligerent employers' associations in California since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act.<sup>2</sup> The amounts of their contributions to the major organizations listed in exhibit B are noted. This table does not purport to include all of those who made contributions to

any of the six organizations selected; such a table would have been unduly cumbersome. A more completely detailed analysis of the contributors to each of these associations is contained in later parts of this report. For purposes of comparison there has been included in a sixth column the contributions of the listed firms to the National Association of Manufacturers from 1933 through 1937.

Perhaps the history of each firm's contribution to these various funds will disclose varying reasons; i. e., the attitude of a given manager, the influence of a good customer, the desire to maintain solid relations with influential elements in the business community, et cetera. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that the maintenance of organized antiunionism in California was the direct result of a conscious act of supporting and participating in a conspiracy to prevent or obstruct the development of collective bargaining by lending financial support to a "belligerent" employers' association. Whatever the identity of the prime movers and actors in the formation and maintenance of these conspiracies, and they will be noted later, those who furnish the sinews for this war on civil liberties cannot escape their share of the responsibility.

The effects of the National Labor Relations Act in California must be assessed in the light of the implacable opposition to it from such antiunion employers' association. Through economic and social pressure, publicity, and wholesale public deception, these associations have waged relentless war on the principles of this act. Oftentimes they coerced those who desired to comply with it, deluding and confusing others as to its objectives and benefits.

It is here important to emphasize the role of the antiunion association in preventing the business community from accepting the processes of collective bargaining. Had these associations been dissolved or their efforts diverted into proper channels in 1935, after the passage of the act, it is safe to say that labor relations in California would have had a more peaceful course—at least they would have been consonant with our national labor policy.

Viewing the period as a whole, it may be said that the act has not completely shielded organizations of employees from the devices and assaults of the antiunion employers' associations. Time and again the unions have had to resort to the self-help of strikes and other economic action in order to secure collective bargaining or protect their members. The language of such action appears to have been more readily understood by these belligerent employers' associations than the mandate of a Federal statute. Nevertheless, the statute held out the hope which led employees to organize and assert their rights as members of an economic democracy. The increasing defection of sensible employers and employer groups from the ranks of antiunion belligerency can, at least indirectly, be attributed to the statute. That a greater area of California's industry is today covered by the practice of collective bargaining than ever before is in large measure the fruit of the act.

But the act has not yet overcome a principal obstacle to free collective bargaining, namely, the antiunion employers' association. This fact calls for some public action supplementary to the administrative method and penalties established in the National Labor Relations Act. Organized antiunionism taking the form of the "belligerent" employers' association, is a challenge now to our Government and our free society which cannot be ignored. These organizations cannot be indulged by the gentle measures and limited procedures of that legislation. A deliberate conspiracy to violate the law of the land in wholesale fashion must be stamped out for the subversive attitude which it represents.

<sup>10</sup> For an account of the events leading up to the formation of Southern Californians, Inc., and its subsequent activities, see part VI of this report, sec. 3, Second Reorganization of the Los Angeles "Open Shop" Movement in 1937, especially ch. 1, Creation of Southern Californians, Inc., ch. 2, General Description of Southern Californians, Inc., and ch. 4, Function and Activities of Southern Californians, Inc.

<sup>11</sup> For a description of The Neutral Thousands, see part VI of this report, sec. 4, Activities of Los Angeles Employers' Associations, ch. 1, Promotion of The Neutral Thousands, and ch. 2, Propaganda Campaign of Los Angeles Employers' Associations.

<sup>12</sup> For an account of the sponsorship of the Employees Advisory Service by Southern Californians, Inc., see Part VI of this report, sec. 4, ch. 3, subsec. J.

<sup>13</sup> The formation and activities of the Farmers Transportation Association are described in Part VIII of this report, sec. 4, ch. 5.

<sup>1</sup> See the appendix to this pt. V of the report, p. 784.

<sup>2</sup> See the appendix to this pt. V of the report, pp. 784-787.



Previous to its California inquiry, the committee had investigated the labor policies and practices of employers' associations in the metal-trades industry,<sup>3</sup> the Cleveland industrial area,<sup>4</sup> the Little Steel companies,<sup>5</sup> and, finally, the National Association of Manufacturers.<sup>6</sup> In California the committee was able to extend its examination to many outstanding examples of various types of anti-union associations. It was possible to observe not only their individual impact on labor relations in their particular area of concern, but also to view the over-all facts of their interrelation. It was this California experience that confirmed the committee's feeling that it was necessary to expand the concrete recommendations for legislation which it had previously submitted to the Congress.

Upon its return from California, the committee conducted an intensive review of its previous recommendations for legislation, in the light of disclosures concerning organized antiunionism in California. Its previous recommendations took the form of the so-called Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1939 which passed the Senate in the spring of 1940 but was not acted upon by the House before the end of the session.<sup>7</sup> The proposed act of 1939 was directed to the creation of criminal sanctions, to be enforced by the Department of Justice on recommendation from the Department of Labor, for specific types of antiunion practices. The practices to be proscribed were labor espionage, professional strikebreaking, the use of industrial munitions, and certain abuses of private police systems. The practices defined were to be outlawed whether carried on by individuals or groups.

The process of amplification of the former proposal, in the light of the California experience, was completed and has taken concrete form in the proposed Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942.<sup>8</sup> This proposal is an amplification of the previous recommendation in three distinct phases.

First, it adds to the specific oppressive labor practices other than those prescribed in the previous bill; namely, labor espionage, professional strikebreaking, use of industrial munitions, and abuse of private police systems. The new practices prescribed include: vigilantism, blacklisting, employer agreements to refrain from collective bargaining, so-called yellow-dog practices, and coercion of employers or employees to prevent them from practicing collective bargaining. Some of these practices, carried on by employers singly and collectively in California, were a direct inspiration for these provisions.

The second phase of the amplification concerns the application of the concept of conspiracy to participation in the entire coterie of oppressive labor practices. This part of

the measure goes to the heart of organized antiunionism and the conduct of "belligerent" employers' association, such as was evident in California. It was designed expressly to take advantage of the ordinary and accepted theories of Anglo-American jurisprudence to extend the responsibility for criminal acts, not only to the people who physically commit them, but also to those who knowingly plan, assist, or make possible their execution. The law of criminal conspiracy in this country has been developed to the point that it could be extremely useful in proceeding against organized antiunion activity which is determined to be criminal in character. Employers in California who carried on the oppressive labor practices outlined in the proposed legislation customarily did so pursuant to a plan through the mechanism of an organization. Indeed, the essence of the operations of "belligerent" employers' associations in California was the highly organized way in which they carried on mass assaults on the exercise of labor's rights. To such action the law of criminal conspiracy is properly applicable, when the practices conducted by such organized groups are criminal in character, according to the law of the land. Yet, by use of the law of criminal conspiracy, the punishment of the innocent with the guilty can be avoided. Innocents and dupes must be protected even if their views are not in accord with public policy so long as their deliberate acts are not in violation of the law.

The third phase of this amplification was a natural outgrowth of the second phase which was carefully designed to permit legitimate employers' associations of a negotiatory character to operate and perform their useful service. It was a provision requiring the registration and regular filing of information with the National Labor Relations Board by all organized employer groups dealing in labor relations. The observations in this report of the committee concerning the course of the development of employers' associations in California indicate the basis for such a provision. Employers' associations may be belligerent in character, regularly acting pursuant to a policy of hostility to collective bargaining and the exercise of the rights of labor; tomorrow, due to various sets of circumstances, that policy may change and the employers' associations may become negotiatory in character and spirit. Yet, sometime in the future there may be a danger of reversion to the early policy. Therefore, it is desirable to accept the negotiatory employers' association as a proper and desirable exercise of the rights of employers. But it is also desirable to compel it to submit regularly information with which it will be possible to detect the drift of the organization to unlawful conspiratorial practices.

One would not have to go beyond the pages of this part of the report on California to find complete and adequate reasons for the passage of this oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942. The national policy for collective bargaining will never be secured in California so long as the belligerent employers' association, carrying on the practices outlined in the proposed act, can function without fear of severe sanctions. This report makes it clear for all who would read that this is not a theory but a fact.

Therefore, the committee urges that its legislative recommendation in the form of the oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942 be studied and appraised in the light of recent California history, as summarized in this volume. It may well be that collective bargaining as a national policy is accepted in some areas of the country and that organized antiunionism in those areas no longer exists. But we do not know and dare not conjecture that California, in the years 1935 through 1939, does not and will not have its counterparts in other areas of the Nation. It is a commonly known and widely accepted fact

that many other sections of the country are even less sophisticated about democratic labor relations than California, which may be relatively progressive in many aspects. Indeed, in some areas industrial absolutism is still the order of the day. When confronted by the necessities and realities of industrial democracy, the spirit of antiunionism in those areas may well take even cruder forms of organized antiunionism than has been apparent in California in the years since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. In any event, the California case history stands as demonstrable proof of the necessity for striking down by national action not only oppressive labor practices but their organized and conspiratorial culmination.

It is safe to say that the principle of collective bargaining will never be secure in California so long as the present bitter conflict continues in its agriculture. So long as collective bargaining is excluded from industrialized agriculture in California, the whole principle of collective bargaining will remain in jeopardy. Our analysis demonstrates that the antiunion association now has its firmest support in the agricultural industry where, through organizational, financial, and economic ties, it continues to menace urban and industrial unions and deprive agricultural workers of their civil rights. This condition cannot be improved unless some statutory protection is extended to the exercise by agricultural employees of the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining, as part III of this report makes abundantly clear, is not the sole answer to California's agricultural problem. It must be supplemented by other measures, such as the organization of the labor market, various types of direct economic assistance to the worker if necessary, the restoration of political rights, and the provision of some degree of economic security. If a beginning can be made in these things while, at the same time, collective bargaining in agriculture is encouraged and protected, the cloud may lift from the future of California's labor relations, industrial and rural.

Yet another ally of organized antiunionism must be appraised on the basis of the California investigation. It is the susceptibility of law-enforcement officials to organized pressures within a community, which may result in the prostitution of law enforcement to antiunion policies. That type of abuse appears all too often in the record of California labor history.

This is not to say that law-enforcement officials should not discharge the responsibilities of their high office in enforcing the laws against violence, property damage, and breach of the public peace. It is to say that law-enforcement officials, in discharging their functions, must be ever wary to avoid becoming the cat's paw of either employer or employee. For these officials to become the willing or unwitting agents of organized antiunionism is to open the door to flagrant injustice and give reason for a most unfortunate disrespect to law and authority. The public should be ever wary of this perversion of police power. It is oftentimes a harbinger of local political tyranny that holds all civil liberty in contempt. Indeed, the best and surest protection against most of the excesses of organized antiunionism, as typified by the belligerent employers' association, is the good sense and vigilance of the general public.

Quite realistically, the forces that seek to maintain industrial autocracy have come to realize in recent years that public opinion is the final arbiter. In times past, they have been able to attack trade-unionism and collective bargaining with a "public be damned" attitude. Now all that is different, and the principal emphasis is upon the "third party" technique. Organized antiunionism will seek indirectly, through public opinion and

<sup>3</sup> S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 4 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part I, The National Metal Trades Association.

<sup>4</sup> S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 5 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) Labor Policies of Employers' Association, Part II, The Associated Industries of Cleveland.

<sup>5</sup> S. Rept. No. 151 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part IV, The Little Steel Strike and Citizens' The Little Steel Strike and Citizens' Committees.

<sup>6</sup> S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 6 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), Labor Policies of Employers' Associations Part III, The National Association of Manufacturers.

<sup>7</sup> This bill, called S. 1970 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) was passed on May 27, 1940.

<sup>8</sup> S. 2435. For the text of the bill as introduced and the statement of Senator LA FOLLETTE accompanying the introduction, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 1942, vol. 88, no. 69, pp. 3308-3316.

the acts of public officials in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, to turn the tide that has been running so strongly against it in the last decade. The anti-picketing ordinances. Proposition No. 1 in 1938, and other legislation such as the recently enacted "hot cargo" bill are illustrations of organized efforts toward legislative restriction of trade-union rights and activities. The trend of this legislative drive, if it becomes an indiscriminating wave, will sweep away the rights of labor under color of law at the prompting of organized anti-unionism. In the final analysis, it is a keen sense of justice, a constant attempt by the public to be fair, a sharp sense for recognizing misleading propaganda, and added public support of democratic institutions and practices that are the best hope for a stabilized system of collective bargaining in California.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,  
United States Senator.  
ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
United States Senator.

#### CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdoch	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The able senior Senator from Ohio and I have reported the joint resolution. The Senator from Ohio is familiar with it. I would ask him to explain it, in addition to explaining some amendments he proposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Senator from Ohio is recognized, I desire to make a very brief statement with reference to the parliamentary status of the measure. I was not present in the Senate, because I had not returned to the city, when the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill was taken up several weeks ago, and the question of subsidies was injected into it. As originally introduced, the measure provided simply

for an extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an increase in the borrowing power of the Corporation; but, as everyone knows, it later became complicated with the question of subsidies; and the President vetoed the bill last week, and the House sustained the veto. Nothing can be gained by going into the bill that was vetoed, or by going into the veto. The House sustained the veto, and it became necessary, unless the Commodity Credit Corporation was to expire, to extend its life.

The House by a joint resolution provided simply for extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January of next year, practically 6 months from now, and increasing the amount of its borrowing power from \$2,650,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000, an increase of \$350,000,000, on the theory that between now and January, Congress would have time and opportunity to work out more permanent legislation, and probably from the experience which would be gathered between now and that date would be able to devise a wiser solution of this very complex and difficult problem.

Personally, I should prefer to have the House joint resolution, which is simple, extending the life of the Corporation until January, passed by the Senate. But the Banking and Currency Committee, in session Saturday afternoon and evening, adopted an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio, with some modifications suggested in the committee, placing certain limitations with respect to the amount of money which might be available between now and January 1 for the purposes which have been under discussion. The amendment, which is in the bill, I think amply safeguards the situation with respect to all corporations, both the R. F. C., the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Office of Price Administration, and all others, involved in the enforcement of ceilings and the administration of subsidies. I am informed by those who are responsible and who will be responsible for the enforcement and administration of the act that it can be made to work under the amendments which have been agreed to in the committee and which have been subsequently discussed.

That is all I care to say at this time. I understand the Senator from Ohio desires to explain the amendments which he sponsored and which the committee adopted in the session on Saturday.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The House did not include subsidies in its proposition; did it?

Mr. BARKLEY. The House joint resolution simply provides for an extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January. The House did not say anything in the resolution about subsidies; but I may say to the Senator that the theory upon which the Senate committee amended the joint resolution is that without such an amendment the Commodity Credit Corporation would have unlimited power to exercise the right to contract for subsidies, whereas the amendment which

was agreed to would limit the amount which could be used for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. My understanding was that the House passed the resolution extending the time and giving the Commodity Credit Corporation certain funds with which to operate, without referring to subsidies.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; the resolution made no reference to subsidies. But, I will say to the Senator, that does not mean no subsidies would be made. As we all know, without specific authority beyond that already given by laws governing the Commodity Credit Corporation heretofore enacted, payments have been made with respect to subsidies for certain commodities. The amendment offered and agreed to in the committee would limit the amount which could be expended for subsidies.

Mr. SMITH. But it does authorize subsidies; does it?

Mr. BARKLEY. No more than they have heretofore been authorized. It simply limits them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the risk of being repetitious, let me inquire whether I am to understand from the Senator's explanation that if the Senate committee amendment is not agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation can engage in the subsidy business without any limitation, but that if the Senate committee amendment is agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation can engage in the subsidy business only within the limitations of the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was the theory of those who sponsored the amendment that, without it, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be without restriction as to the scope of its subsidy activities, but that with the amendment in the joint resolution, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be limited according to the terms of the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, to state the matter in another way, if one were opposed to all subsidies, and felt that even the emergent circumstances set forth would not incline him to depart from that position, the only way he could register his views would be to vote against the House joint resolution without the Senate committee amendment or to vote against the House resolution even with the Senate committee amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if anyone were unalterably opposed to voting for anything that carried a subsidy, either by definition or by implication, the only way he could accomplish his own purpose would be to vote against everything.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But to do that would be to cause the Commodity Credit Corporation, which everyone admits is doing constructive work, to go completely out of business.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to ask a question merely for information. If the



Senate accepts the joint resolution as sent over by the House, would the administration be permitted to proceed with subsidies as it has heretofore?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so. I think that is the interpretation we are bound to place on the mere continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it is continued in the same way in which it has heretofore operated, with additional funds provided.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the Senator's understanding that the subsidy program as authorized to date by Congress has affected the production of the needed critical materials, either mineral, food, or otherwise?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say that insofar as Congress has specifically authorized subsidies, one of the objects would be to obtain not only critical materials but ample production of any necessary commodity, whether it be a mineral or an agricultural product, that would bring about the desired result.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is the general understanding of those of us who have been especially interested in this legislation—and the leader himself and I are members of the committee which handled the legislation under which the program is being followed—that the subsidy program in general, if not definitely, is for the purpose of increasing production where it is needed, and not for the purpose of decreasing prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there are two objectives in any program of this sort. One is to provide an incentive for increasing production, and the other is to keep the cost of living from getting out of hand by a method which would prevent what we call the continuing spiral, so as to prevent it getting out of hand, where it could not be controlled, not only as to prices, but as to wages and other things which must be taken into consideration in respect to any increase in cost to the consumer of the commodities which he is compelled to buy. There are two prongs to the question, and it is difficult to separate them entirely.

Mr. BUTLER. The amendment intended to be proposed to the joint resolution as it is now before us is for the purpose of making it definite that the subsidy program should not be put into reverse, so to speak, and its purpose made to reduce prices instead of to increase production.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to which amendment the Senator is referring. If he is referring to the committee amendment—

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator is referring to subparagraph (f) on page 5, which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] proposed when the question was before us earlier.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is in the amendment adopted by the committee. I do not care to go into the details of the amendment because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was on the conference committee representing the Senate in connection with the bill which was vetoed, and who has had numerous conferences with the administrators of vari-

ous agencies which will administer the law, will undoubtedly give an explanation of the amendment which he proposed and which the committee accepted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. When we recently voted on this question the Senate very definitely voted against subsidies and roll-backs. The bill then went to the House, and after a conference it went to the President, who vetoed the bill as it passed the Senate. Then it came back to the House, and the House refused to override the Presidential veto. The House was then confronted with the expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate is confronted with that question today.

As I see the picture, the Congress definitely took a position against roll-backs and subsidies. As I see it, following the Presidential veto and the refusal of the House to override it, today the Senate finds itself in this position: We can adopt the House joint resolution as it comes to us from the House. In that form it has nothing to do with subsidies. Or we can adopt the Taft amendment, which not only authorizes subsidies on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but also subsidies by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the only limit being \$350,000,000 up until January 1, 1944.

In view of the congressional policy already voted on, would it not be more consistent to pass the House joint resolution as it came to us from the House, putting ourselves in the position of saying to the executive department, "If you still want to continue your subsidies and roll-backs, even in the face of what the Congress has done, and take full responsibility for them, all right"? In my opinion, if we should vote today to pass the House joint resolution as it came to us, the Senate would find itself in that position, and in my opinion we could thus avoid consenting to either roll-backs or subsidies.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that I agreed with his position, and so voted in the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know the Senator did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I still think that the simpler and better way would be to pass the House joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, with an increase in the amount of money which it may borrow and use.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators who cooperated with him took the position, as sponsors of the amendment, that a simple joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation would place no limitation with respect to the amount of money which might be spent, or the commitments which might be made in regard to subsidies. Desiring to place a limitation on the amount, and on the time element involved in subsidies, the committee adopted the amendment over the vote of the Senator from Utah and myself, and other Senators who were in the minority.

Of course it is true that the Congress could take the position that it has declared against subsidies. It declared against subsidies in such language and under such terms that the President was compelled to veto the bill. The House has refused to override that veto. Therefore the responsibility now rests on the Executive to carry out his program during the period of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not feel that it is necessary for Congress completely to wash its hands of the problem merely because the Presidential veto was not overridden. I say that without yielding my position that it would be better to pass the House joint resolution without amendment. However, if it desired to restrict the exercise of the power of the President and the Commodity Credit Corporation, acting under the R. F. C., to pay out money or to contract for the payment of money on subsidies, this amendment accomplishes that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], which does not involve the Senator from Kentucky. Has the Senator from Kentucky concluded?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have concluded. I yield the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah what his understanding is as to where the President would get the funds to continue any subsidy program, were we to pass simply the language which came over from the House in House Joint Resolution 147.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Executive could declare anything either a critical or strategic material, and then tell the Loan Administrator, Hon. Jesse Jones, "I want \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000, or any amount you can dig up under the law. I am going ahead with these subsidies, now that I have declared this material to be strategic or critical."

Mr. DANAHER. So the only limitation in the mind of the Senator from Utah, as I gather from his answer, is the authorized borrowing power of the R. F. C.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I think that whatever the R. F. C. or its subsidiaries can dig up constitutes the only limit on the President's program of subsidies.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am hopeful that the Senator will not only thank me, but will agree with me.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree with the Senator from Utah to the extent that were we not to impose some limitation, we would open the door wide, without the slightest limitation whatever, provided only that section 2 (e) of the original Emergency Price Control Act were to be construed as the Senator from Utah says it might be construed.

I do not share that particular view, because I think there are two limitations contained in section 2 (e) of the original Emergency Price Control Act. But, Mr. President, because of the very view which the Senator has expressed, many of us

have had fears which resulted in the adoption by the committee of the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Incidentally, it represents the consensus of many views, which fact has resulted in a majority of the committee adopting and thereafter recommending the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. When the Senator says "we open the door," does he not mean the door is already open? Under the present law the door is open now, and the only limit on the width of space the door is open is provided by the ability of the R. F. C. to obtain money to supply for the subsidy program. I ask the Senator if I am not correct in my statement that today that is the only limitation under the law as construed by the executive department, namely, the ability of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to dig up the money?

Mr. DANAHER. Answering the question of the Senator specifically, I will say that so far as the money limitation is concerned, the answer is "Yes." However, Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in a general explanation of the committee amendment. Quite the contrary, I believe that is the function of the Senator from Ohio, who, in my judgment, is entitled to the support of the committee and of the Senate in what he has to say. I interrogated the Senator from Utah merely on the point he first emphasized, in order that the entire limits of the situation might be before us. I thank the Senate for the opportunity of speaking.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Ohio about to explain the joint resolution before we go ahead?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the joint resolution itself hardly requires explanation. What I should like to explain are the amendments as presented by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Very little of the measure as it came from the House is left.

Mr. TAFT. It is all here except section 4.

Mr. GEORGE. What I meant was that what the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has inserted is far longer in sections and subsections than what has been left of the original House text.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct, but it seems to me that the proper way to proceed is to consider the committee amendments, one after another. There are three committee amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment was in the original bill previously passed and was contained in the conference report as adopted by both Houses. However, since the passage of that bill and the veto, we have received very strenuous objection from the Federal Reserve, the senior Senator from Virginia, and the Comptroller of the Currency. The purpose of the proposed section was that the provision that banks cannot loan to their own officers should not apply when 100 percent of the loan was guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and was entirely an obligation of the United States. In effect, such a loan was one by the United States to one of the officers of the bank, instead of to the bank. However, the Federal Reserve Board feels they have steadily tightened the rules relating to the loaning of money by the banks to their own officers and directors, and therefore they regard the House language as a backward step. The committee on the whole felt it was desirable that the section be eliminated, since its importance would not justify action contrary to the general policy upon which the Federal Reserve Board has been insisting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 4. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 2, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

(a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided*, That in any case in which a commodity is domestically produced, the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by this subsection shall be exercised with respect to importations of such commodity only to the

extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor. Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, when requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed \$350,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation, when requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed \$175,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(e) The President may transfer any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (c) hereof for use under paragraph (d), or any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (d) for use under paragraph (c). The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may exercise any of the powers conferred herein through any of its subsidiary corporations.

(f) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers, or the sale of feed wheat, as authorized by existing law; and no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the legislative history of this measure is clear. The Congress passed a bill prohibiting subsidies, prohibiting in particular the roll-back subsidies on meat and butter, which have occasioned the greatest controversy. That bill was sent to the President. The President vetoed it, and returned it to the House of Representatives, where the veto was sustained. The President suggested in his message that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued; that if there were time to work out a further compromise measure on subsidies, Congress should do so; if not, Congress should simply pass a joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The President suggested that representatives of the executive departments would be glad to confer with Congress regarding the development of what might be called a compromise policy.



That policy, Mr. President, has been carried out. We have asked the representatives of the executive department to come before the committee. We have conferred with Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Brown, Jesse Jones, and with Mr. Hutson, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, who also acts as representative of Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator. We have tried to work out a policy in which I myself do not believe, but which it seems to me we are called upon to adopt if we are to deal at all constructively with the situation.

It is suggested that Congress should say, "It is the responsibility of the executive department; go ahead, spend \$2,000,000,000, \$3,000,000,000, or whatever you may want to spend; that is your responsibility; we have no responsibility."

Mr. President, we have not taken that position in any instance involving the appropriation of money during the present session. We have seriously assumed the responsibility of seeing to it that money is not spent by the executive department in greater sums than we desire to have it spent. It seems to me we have just as much responsibility to limit the amount of money which may be required for subsidies as we have to limit the amount of money which may be required by way of appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the Senator point out any control or restriction which we exert on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the financing, say, of the Bureau of Economic Warfare, or of any other agency that the R. F. C. want to finance or any plants they may want to build? I do not recall any except a limitation of the obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may create.

Mr. TAFT. We have, however, limited them as to what they may do in the case of plants having directly to do with the war effort. We have given them, I think, much too broad powers, if you please, and we are in this box today because Congress has passed laws which were not regarded as money laws, but simply laws giving general powers to this Government corporation.

My real interest in this bill is found in the first clause of section 5.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss—

Which, of course, is another method of paying subsidies, in effect—

or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

The purpose of that provision is to reverse the burden of proof. If we can once do that, then, when the money runs out,

whatever money may be provided, not another cent can be spent until the corporation comes back to the Congress and asks for additional money, just as the Departments have to do in the case of every other appropriation with which Congress has to deal.

We have got ourselves in this position by passing laws granting powers which are too broad. As it stands today, the Commodity Credit Corporation can pay subsidies; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can pay subsidies. There may be some question as to the legality of the manner in which they paid the roll-back subsidies, but they have a legal argument to support them, and I do not know who can question their actual carrying out of the policy which they have announced.

So it seems to me, unless we have some such provision, if we should adopt the House joint resolution, in effect, saying, "All right, Mr. President, we have no further interest; do as you please," there is nothing, so far as I can see, when we return to Washington after the recess, that will prevent our being committed to a subsidy burden of \$2,000,000,000, or \$3,000,000,000, or any other figure.

Not only that, but I do not believe anybody will ever come to Congress again and ask for money for subsidies; the question will never be before us, for the simple reason that there will be no reason for such a request. Under existing laws, the executive authority can act and freely spend the money they want on subsidies. That is a procedure I want to have stopped.

I was disappointed when Mr. Byrnes last Saturday appealed to the Banking and Currency Committee to do just that: "Leave it to us; we will handle it all right," because it seems to me to show a desire to go ahead and continue an unlimited subsidy as the executive department might desire. Since then, however, I have been informed that Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Brown approve the joint resolution which is now before the Senate, with one or two amendments, which I shall later suggest, and that they personally will recommend the approval of the joint resolution to the President.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In line with what the Senator from Ohio was saying as to the effect of the committee proposal, if adopted, in limiting the amount which could be spent on any particular subsidy program, take, for example, the proposed roll-back program on meat, which in part becomes effective today, as I understand, and which, if the pending measure should pass would continue in effect until December 31. Does the Senator think it would be possible then to discontinue the roll-back program until additional money was appropriated?

Mr. TAFT. It is just as possible to discontinue it on the 1st of January as it is to discontinue it today. It can be discontinued by simply raising the price of meat to the consumer, or, in the case of butter, by raising the price

of butter to the consumer. It can be discontinued at any time. There is no difference between discontinuing it tomorrow and discontinuing it the 1st of January, so far as I can see.

But my own feeling as to the continuance of the subsidy program is this: If when we return here in October we find, through the operation of subsidy programs and other policies the Government has succeeded without serious interference with production and that prices that are approximately on the same level, it is probable that Congress will approve a continuation of the subsidy program.

If, on the other hand, as I fear, when we return, in spite of the subsidy program, prices have increased 1 percent a month, as they have been increasing, it will make clear that the subsidy program, after all, cannot accomplish that purpose, and it may also become clear that even if that purpose is accomplished it has interfered with the production of essential foodstuffs. In effect this measure says "You may continue this program until the 1st of January, but if the R. F. C. wishes to continue the program it must come back to Congress and ask for additional authority to go on in the year 1944." If we do not pass this measure, they can go on indefinitely, and not only that, they can extend it to every other agricultural product, and gradually expand the subsidy program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming, who, I think, was first on his feet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of confusion with respect to the discussion of roll-backs because the interpretation of the meaning of that word has not been the same by all persons who have taken part in the discussion. When the representatives of the producers ask for the abandonment of the roll-back program what they are concerned about is not that the cost of living shall not be reduced; it is simply that the returns of the producer of agricultural commodities shall not be reduced below the cost of production.

In the hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, which was held Saturday afternoon, and which I was privileged to attend, former Senator Brown, speaking for the O. P. A., said, if I understood him correctly, that it was not the purpose of O. P. A. to operate the subsidy program in such fashion as to reduce the return to the producers. The amendment which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I offered last Saturday and asked to have lie on the desk, and which was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee and rejected, was intended to bring about the objective of stopping a roll-back on the producer. We offered the amendment in the belief that it was absolutely essential to guarantee to the producers of agricultural commodities that their returns shall not be touched if we hope to

obtain the agricultural commodities which are necessary to feed the consumers.

Now I ask the Senator would there be any objection to the inclusion in the committee amendment of language which would write into the law the announcement which has been made by those who will have in charge the administration of this proposed act?

I call attention to the fact that when I presented the original amendment last week, I inserted in the Record a letter from Mr. Burke, the Assistant O. P. A. Administrator, in which he stated that the price cut on meat and milk of 10 percent was not intended to deprive the producer of the returns he was then getting.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the difficulty with the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and the amendment which they are considering offering today, is that it provides that the carrying out of existing subsidy programs may be completed, except that roll-back programs with respect to milk and livestock and their products shall not be continued beyond July 31, 1943.

That was the exact provision contained in the bill which was passed by both Houses, and it was the exact provision which brought about the veto of the bill. Consequently, if it is inserted in the pending bill, there is no question whatever that the President will veto the bill, and, as we probably will have left Washington by that time, it will mean the destruction of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I cannot see any justifiable reason for Congress undertaking to repass the same bill which was previously passed. As I understand, the Senator says that what Mr. Brown stated was that there was no intention to roll the price back on the producer. He said in so many words that that was not the purpose, and we have provided on page 5, line 6, that "no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment—the greatest difficulty has arisen because the roll-back subsidy on meat was most ineptly carried out, and that undoubtedly had the effect not only of rolling back on the producer, where the roll-back was supposed to stop, but it went on to the price of cattle.

I do not think that is a necessary incident to a roll-back program, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] offered an amendment, and he told the Senate when the bill was here before that he offered it as an amendment to a committee amendment similar to that now under consideration. We have provided that every possible step shall be taken to accomplish the purpose we indicated.

That is not difficult in the case of something on which a price is fixed, like butter. There has not been any trouble on the part of the producer of butter, as I understand, except in the case of the small farmer cited by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. In which case the original price fixed, as in the case of cattle, is more difficult to handle, and yet Mr. Jones and Mr. Brown themselves say they can make suitable regulations to prevent any such result. But if we merely try to accomplish the object by saying there shall be no roll-back program, and that the meat and butter programs shall terminate on the 1st of August, the inevitable result, of course, will be a veto. There is no question about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio about the provision that no reduction shall be made to producers of livestock and producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back, and so on. How does he intend that that provision shall be enforced? I should like to have him tell us how it could be enforced. Suppose the big packing houses go to a farmer and say "The market for cattle has gone down, therefore we have to pay you 3 cents a pound less than we did 2 months ago." That might be the direct result of the roll-back but how is anyone to prove it? How is a provision that there shall be no reduction to the farmer or producer because of a roll-back to be enforced?

Mr. TAFT. I am really not advised how it can be done, and so long as there is a variable price, it is a difficult thing. How are we to assure the producer that he is getting what he is entitled to out of the present price of meat without any roll-back? It is as difficult a problem as to see that he gets the benefit of the roll-back. He would get it if we got a tight enough margin on the processor and saw that he did not have an excess of definite margins.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator from Ohio that the roll-back on meat was announced while there was a fairly rapid falling market for livestock. All grades of stock were falling then, and cattle and hogs were coming into the market in quantities, so that for the first time the amount coming to the market was equal to or exceeded that of the previous year. It is a very serious question whether, if the administration had not announced this roll-back program and checked that flow of stock into the market, the price would not have been lower today than it is, with the roll-back in effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the argument made by the Senator from Vermont is interesting, but wholly irrelevant, because if the amendment shall be rejected the roll-back will continue just the same, except that it will not have the protection we have tried to put into the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to ask the Senator from Ohio a question similar to that propounded by the Senator from Vermont, because I confess that, to my mind, it is rather difficult to understand how the provision on page 5, beginning in line 6, to which the Senator referred, can be enforced. Let me read it:

No reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made.

And so forth. That would have been an understandable amendment if we had retained the provision of the amendment which I originally proposed, namely, that subsidies should be paid only to producers. But that is out.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I are not wedded to any particular language to prevent this roll-back upon the producer, and since the committee has adopted this language, open to criticism though it may be, for the express purpose of preventing a loss to the producer, let me ask the Senator whether there will be any objection to the substitution, for the language I have just read, of a sentence somewhat as follows:

Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor the Commodity Credit Corporation shall adopt any subsidy program unless convinced that such program will not result in reducing the prices to the producers of agricultural commodities.

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be entirely acceptable language. I think it carries out exactly the purpose of this section, and if the Senator thinks the language stronger it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the consent of my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I shall move a perfecting amendment, to strike out the words to which I have referred, and substitute the phraseology I have just dictated on the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator proposes to strike out from line 6 to line 13?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; putting a period after the word "law," and beginning a new sentence on page 5, line 6, and then introducing a new sentence to take the place of the remainder of line 6, all of line 7, all of line 8, and all of line 9, down to the word "made" in line 10, substituting in lieu thereof the language which the Official Reporter will have to read to me, since I did not have it written.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield to me, I call his attention to the fact that while the language he would strike out deals only with livestock and dairy products, upon which there has been a subsidy program inaugurated, the language which he would substitute deals with all sorts of agricultural products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but every statement which has been made to me by those who represent the Commodity



Credit Corporation, the O. P. A., and the Office of War Mobilization, agrees that there should be no reduction of the price to the producer of any agricultural product. I am sure from telephone conversations which I have had within the last hour that the Senator will find no substantial disagreement with the language which I have suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not expressing any disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I am not certain whether everyone understands that the language which the Senator offers as a substitute covering all agricultural products is in the place of language in the bill which deals with only two products.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have the language of the Senator's amendment again read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will consult the Official Reporter. Let the Official Reporter read the language.

The Official Reporter [Mr. Rhodes] read as follows:

Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor the Commodity Credit Corporation shall adopt any subsidy program unless convinced that such program will not result in reducing the prices to the producers of agricultural commodities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator from Wyoming think that that language is stronger than the directive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it shall issue suitable regulations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not striking out that language; it remains in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator add except merely to say that the officials of the R. F. C. and C. C. C. must be convinced that they are not going to do something that they say they are not going to do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to write into the law and make clear that the Congress understands that that is what is intended, and I am substituting my proposal for language which obviously is unenforceable, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has clearly pointed out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the able Senator from Wyoming will give about 10 extra minutes of his notable ability and agility with the English language to work on this thing, I am sure he will devise something better than a mandate that the officials in question shall convince themselves that they shall not do what they say they will not do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For the moment, Mr. President, I am satisfied with the acceptance by the spokesman for the Committee on Banking and Currency of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the effect of the amendment is the same as the language of the bill, except that it extends the prohibition with respect to livestock and dairy products to all commodities. I am perfectly willing, and I think all members of the committee would be willing to accept that extension. I think it should be pointed out that it

does not prohibit possible roll-backs of agricultural prices such as, for instance, prices of fresh vegetables, but it prohibits the use of subsidies to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Which I think is a perfectly sound principle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if the language now in the bill does not do exactly what the Senator wants to do for livestock and dairy products?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; if the Senator from Ohio will permit me to occupy the floor in his time, it does not do so effectively. It is true it announces that policy, but it is perfectly impossible of enforcement. The price which is paid to the producers of livestock is under the language of the bill a matter which is altogether beyond the control of the R. F. C. In my proposed substitute I provide that whatever is within the control of the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be dealt with in their judgment in such a manner as not to bring about reduction in prices.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the Senator's objection based on the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not included in the language of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my objection is that the provision "and no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers" is unenforceable, because it is not the action of the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation under the language of the committee amendment as it is now drafted, which would control the price. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] just said, my amendment declares that no subsidy program shall be adopted for the purpose of reducing the price. It makes effective the objective which is not effective under the language of the measure reported by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if he has any assurance from the representatives of the executive department, Mr. Brown, Mr. Byrnes, and others, that they do not intend to embark upon further subsidies—an extension of the subsidy program.

Mr. TAFT. They have given me no assurance of that kind. In fact, the money provided for in the measure would probably authorize some additional subsidy programs broad enough to cover the existing program. The Senator will remember that the program for meat and butter will cost about \$450,000,000, according to former estimates, which would be \$225,000,000 for 6 months.

On the other hand, it is necessary to commit one's self ahead to some extent,

so that the \$350,000,000 not only covers the actual expenditures during the next 6 months, but must cover a month or two beyond that time, because the program cannot simply be arbitrarily terminated even on the first of a given month. It must be worked in with the crop season and the assurance given by the producers.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I ask the question is that the appropriation made in the bill amounts to \$525,000,000 for the 6-month period. That is \$1,050,000,000 a year. The administration spokesmen or supporters who came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry testified that they thought the whole program of rolling back prices of everything would cost the Government approximately \$2,000,000,000 a year. The Senator will also recall that one of the reasons given by the President for vetoing the bill which was passed by Congress was that he would be unable to extend the program further if that bill became law. That is why I asked if the committee had any assurance at all that even were the so-called compromise amendment adopted, the administration did not intend to go ahead with the whole program for which it had originally planned, and a part of which it had put into effect without the consent of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. The Government cannot go ahead with the full program of \$2,000,000,000, to which the Senator from Vermont refers, because the committee amendment provides that no further commitment shall be entered into beyond the dollars which are stated in it, and that is \$350,000,000, plus \$175,000,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or approximately \$525,000,000 to the 1st of January. As a matter of fact, under the circumstances I think that amount must do them for about 9 months. I would say that the program here presented of \$525,000,000 was equivalent to a total subsidy program on an annual basis of approximately \$700,000,000, as I figure it, because the \$175,000,000, for instance, granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation represents practically the entire subsidy for the whole crop year 1943 on beans and oils and various other products.

The officials in charge of the program have asked us to let them go ahead with respect to the whole 1944 crop, which they figure would cost about \$175,000,000 on an annual basis for the entire year. The R. F. C. program I think would probably operate on the basis of the \$350,000,000 proposed to be provided, which would amount, approximately, to from \$550,000,000 to \$650,000,000 a year, and I do not see how the agencies involved can go further than that, or get anywhere near the \$2,000,000,000 figure to which the Senator has referred, without specific further authorization from Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The primary purpose of the joint resolution passed by the House, which we are considering, is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit

Corporation until January 1. In view of that limitation of time, unless the Congress shall again act, the Commodity Credit Corporation, after January 1, would again expire. As I understand, the effect of the committee amendment, beginning with section 5, is to place a limitation or restriction on existing law until January 1, with respect to the payment of roll-back subsidies to reduce the cost of commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. It places a restriction on all subsidies of all kinds. It does not attempt to distinguish between different kinds, except insofar as the language for the protection of the producer is concerned. It imposes a general limitation on all kinds of subsidies, so that the next time the question comes up the President cannot veto the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me understand clearly one further matter. We agree, do we not, that whatever authority now exists under the law, if any, for roll-back subsidies is contained in section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act. Is not that the Senator's interpretation of it?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It might be accomplished in another way, I may say to the Senator, I think.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But does not the O. P. A. claim authority under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act for the program now in effect?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is not that the source of the authority?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is the source of the authority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming that the committee amendment is agreed to, and that the joint resolution as thus amended is passed, would not the authority under section 2 (e) be in effect after the first of January?

Mr. TAFT. No; section 5 says very clearly, "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e)."

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the amendment would limit the time.

Mr. TAFT. There is no limitation of time. The first provision of section 5 is all-inclusive, for all time to come: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e)," they shall not do any of those things, without provision by Congress of express authority. Then we provide express authority only for the year 1943.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask a further question, in order to clear up the matter: Is it the Senator's interpretation of the committee amendment that, by enacting section 5, Congress would repeal all authority under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, except such as was then conferred by section 5?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct—or by future acts of Congress. In other words, Congress would place section 2 (e) in exactly the condition in which it intended it to be, I think—an authorization bill which could not be carried out without further appropriation by Congress. Congress would revise section 2 (e) in that way, so that in the future Congress would have to appropriate money in order to carry out the provisions of section 2 (e). Otherwise, there would be

no money with which to carry out its purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, by agreeing to the amendment, the Senate will definitely give legislative sanction to this kind of a roll-back program, whereas at present there is some question about whether such authority actually exists under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct in that there is an interesting legal question. There is no practical question. As a practical matter, there is a roll-back subsidy today, and it will continue indefinitely unless Congress sees fit to take action to stop it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree; and the Congress must take responsibility for continuing the existing authority, if there is any. If there is not, then by the amendment the Senator asks the Senate to grant authority to legalize what is being done. That is the position in which we find ourselves. I should like to see limitations imposed, if the proposed action is taken. However, since I do not favor the principle, since I think it is a mistake and is something that will lead into a program over which Congress will not have control, and which will go on and on, I oppose the proposal. I do not want to discover that, by having voted for the committee amendments, I have put myself in such a position that later it can be said that I gave my sanction, by vote, for the creation of the system for 6 months.

Mr. TAFT. I would say that the Senator cannot escape responsibility for it. He gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation \$15,000,000,000, with practically unlimited right to spend the money. Congress passed the Price Control Act with section 2 (e) in a vague and general form, and without absolutely definite provision that more money must be appropriated. Therefore, he cannot escape responsibility for the granting of the powers the Senate has carelessly granted to the Executive. The Senate's job today is to recall some of those powers and to assume some of the responsibility the Congress should have assumed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further observation?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When the Senator said that I could not escape responsibility because of the situation—

Mr. TAFT. I was speaking of the Senate as a whole, not of the Senator from Arkansas in particular.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not now want to give my approval to what the Senator says was a mistake Congress made when it did not make the provisions more specific. I would not agree to a proposal to remove any question about the authority, and to vote in favor of the principle.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, that authority for roll-back subsidies is provided by section 2

(e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, and, as he suggested, by other methods which he did not detail. Whether the Senator had in mind that he did not wish to reveal the other methods, for fear they might be used, of course, I do not know. [Laughter.]

It is true that there is legal authority for what has been done. Regarding the authority, there may be legal dispute, without which the legal profession would have to go out of business, for it could not continue to live without the existence of disputes requiring interpretation of the law. However, I think all will agree that, regardless of what may be the authority under section 2 (e) or under any other general legislation, all the committee amendment would do would be to restrict or modify the authority; and we all understand that the modification is proposed to any authority heretofore conferred on the agencies to engage in the program without limit. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not familiar with what went on in the committee room. I have listened to the debate today in the hope of gaining sufficient information to enable me to vote intelligently. I have listened to what the Senator from Ohio has said in his colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas. I rise to ask why the date of January 1, 1944, was selected for ending subsidies, rather than August 1, or September 1, 1943.

Mr. TAFT. For the reason that the joint resolution the House passed and sent to the Senate runs to December 31, 1943. The House selected a 6 months' period, and we tried to work out the figures accordingly.

Furthermore, we thought that if Congress reconvened on the 15th of September, as I understand is intended, it might be rather difficult to obtain any legislation for a month or 6 weeks, and it might well be November before any further legislation could be enacted.

Mr. TYDINGS. My purpose in inquiring of the Senator was that I thought perhaps the O. P. A. had made some commitments in advance which would require Congress in good faith to provide for such a term.

Mr. TAFT. There was no special significance in the date selected, so far as I know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I should like to say that it was recognized in the House that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation could well be extended for 6 months, let us say; because if the extension were made only to the 1st of September or the 1st of October, Congress then would be faced with the necessity of extending its life again, and the program would be extended with the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.



Mr. TYDINGS. What I desire to ascertain is whether the subsidies of the O. P. A. has inaugurated should not be considered in connection with the desire to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the 1st of January. Why should not the Congress provide for termination of both within 6 months, and end them? Unless the O. P. A. has made commitments which we might feel morally bind the Government to continue the program until January 1, 1944, it seems to me that the logical and forthright way to end the subsidy business, if we want to end it, is to fix a date, say August 1, 1944, rather than to have 5 extra months.

Mr. TAFT. As I pointed out, if we were to terminate it at that date, the bill would be vetoed. The reason the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was vetoed was that we terminated the roll-back subsidies on the 1st day of August. I do not see any escape from the perfectly logical conclusion. Whether the period be 4 months or 6 months, or whether the amount be \$250,000,000, \$300,000,000, or \$350,000,000, is not important. The Banking and Currency Committee has finally agreed on these dates with representatives of the executive department in an effort to obtain an agreement, as suggested by the President. Perhaps we have been somewhat liberal. I am willing to be liberal if I can once establish the principle that when this money runs out, whenever it is, the administration will have to come back to Congress and ask for authority to continue the program. Then we shall be in a position in which the President's veto will make no difference; and Congress can decide, by a majority vote, what program it wishes to continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the force of the Senator's position. In other words, his position is that, all things considered, this is the best we can do in the effort to bring about what we want.

Mr. TAFT. And considering the powers which we have already granted in such liberal profusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. My fear is that in going along with that philosophy we shall have incubated the subsidy idea to such an extent that when we arrive at January 1, when it is to end, there will be a demand all over the country that it be continued, and even enlarged and extended.

Mr. TAFT. What does the Senator think is the present effect in the country at large? It is that the Congress, by refusing to override the President's veto, has authorized subsidies. That is the reaction throughout the Nation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Congress assumes the responsibility. Why? Because two-thirds of the House could not be mustered to override the President's veto. Today the people at large consider that Congress has authorized subsidies. If we simply say, "All right; we will go along and continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, and give you exactly what is asked for," the people will have

that opinion in even greater degree than they have it today.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's observations give me the opportunity to say that, of course, roll-backs in prices can be achieved without any subsidies. The O. P. A. now has the authority to roll back prices. Obviously they ought not to be rolled back if the relationship between prices and wages will not justify it. They ought to be rolled back when the relationship between prices and wages shows that the prices of one or more commodities are too high. We gave the O. P. A. the authority to keep prices and wages in line. I dislike to depart from what I think was an honest approach to this problem by saying, "Yes; you may do as you wish." It will be said, "If we can do it for agriculture we can do it for labor; we ought to give labor a subsidy." If we get into the subsidy business, God knows where we will ever emerge. I wish we could have limited it. Even in view of what the Senator has said, which I think makes sense, as a practical consideration I wish we could have limited it to the 1st of August 1944, and ended all commitments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to point out why there would be unlimited money if we should not act. We have authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow \$3,000,000,000. That is a revolving fund. The corporation had a large amount of cotton. It has gradually sold that cotton. As soon as that money comes back it is available for other purchases. It is available for purchases at a loss, and for indirect subsidies. According to the figures I have, the R. F. C. is even better supplied. It has been authorized to borrow \$15,750,000,000. Practically all of that amount is committed. Nevertheless, that money is all rolling in again. People are paying off the loans which the R. F. C. has made to them. So if out of \$15,000,000,000 which it has had \$1,000,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 comes in, that represents only the normal course of its operations. That whole sum is again available to use for subsidies, or indirect financing of this kind of purchases.

So with the powers we have given that agency, we have opened the doors wide. If we do not take some action, I cannot see any limit to the size of the subsidy program. If we should have a program equivalent to that of England, it would require more than \$2,500,000,000 the first year. Unless our control were stronger, the second year it would require \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 a year.

So I am interested in stopping it now, and letting Congress determine, if the administration decides to ask for any extension of the program, whether it will grant such extension.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to make a comment which is somewhat in the nature of an inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I understood the Senator from Arkansas to say a few moments ago that he objected to the pending committee

amendment because he is opposed to the roll-back since he thinks it is probably not warranted by law, and that if we should adopt the committee amendment, it would be more or less of a ratification of the application and principle of the roll-back. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas is in favor of the joint resolution as it passed the House, which would merely extend the existing statute for a period of time. We all know that under the existing statute the roll-back has been put into operation. So if we were to vote for the House measure as it came over from the House, and should be entirely silent as to the matter of the roll-back, would there not be a ratification or endorsement, by inference, at least, of the principle of a roll-back?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator does not maintain that the roll-back was put into operation under the Commodity Credit Corporation law, does he? If there is any authority for it, as the Senator from Ohio has said, it emanates from section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, and not the Commodity Credit Corporation Act.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I realize that the Senator from Arkansas does not believe that the authority to apply roll-backs exists.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During these debates many Senators have said so on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Assuming that the Senator is correct—

Mr. McCLELLAN. The sponsor of the bill which we are now discussing has taken that position on the floor of the Senate. So I am taking the position that if that be true, if those who take that position are correct—and I rather subscribe to it—if we by law actually authorize it, there will no longer be any question about the authority to do the thing.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Are we not really authorizing it when we vote for the joint resolution as it comes over from the House, which would continue the existing law? We know what has been done under existing law. We know that the program of the roll-back has been put into operation. If we vote for the joint resolution as it comes over from the House, and are entirely silent on the question which has been raised as to authority for a roll-back, might not that reasonably be construed as a ratification or endorsement of the principle?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not any more so than if I should vote to continue the R. F. C., because the authority for the program, it is contended, is in another law. The R. F. C. is only the agency through which the authority contained in the other law is exercised.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But if in our vote we should be entirely silent in regard to the question of legality and should merely continue the existing law, I think it might reasonably be assumed that by inference we should be ratifying or accepting the program of the roll-back. We might as well approve expressly the principle as to do so by implication.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think so. I can assure the Senator that he will find, by looking at the RECORD, that I have voted, when I had the opportunity, to try to stop subsidies. I have actually met my responsibility, according to my contentions in that respect. The Chief Executive has done what he conceived to be his duty. We do not agree. Congress did not override his veto. He contended that he had the authority all the time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Suppose I direct my inquiry not only to the Senator from Arkansas, but to the Senate as a whole. If the Senate merely accepts the House joint resolution, it seems to me that there is an acceptance of the idea of subsidies, because we know what is being done, and what will probably be done in the future if the House joint resolution prevails. Whether we pass the House version or the committee amendment we will be accepting the principle of the roll-back unless we state expressly to the contrary. I would rather be direct than indirect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not agree with the Senator, because there is no authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act for roll-backs. The Commodity Credit Corporation is only the agency which is used as a means to the end.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have said all I intend to say.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. If the Senate should fail to take any action whatsoever, save to authorize the further continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in his judgment would there be any way to prevent the administration from inaugurating with respect to all other commodities roll-back subsidies similar to those which are now employed in connection with butter and meat?

Mr. TAFT. I can see no way by which to limit the amount of money which may be spent on such subsidies.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Much as I am opposed to that type of roll-back subsidy, if I vote only to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation I may return after the recess and find that the administration has extended the policy of roll-back subsidies without limit.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. There is one other thought which it seems to me should be conjoined with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, and that is that limitations contained in sections 5 (c) and 5 (d) would operate constantly on every single dime proposed to be appropriated by the joint resolution. Is that not so?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio if it is his considered and final opinion that a total of \$525,000,000 is necessary for the 6 months' period?

Mr. TAFT. It is my considered opinion that \$175,000,000 is absolutely necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation. My amendment as it was offered in the committee provided \$250,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was suggested that the amount should be somewhat larger, and the committee, by a rather substantial vote, decided that it should be. I did not care particularly. I was more concerned with the principle than with the amount. The program actually presented to us could be taken care of with a sum between \$250,000,000 and \$300,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So anything beyond that figure is an invitation to a further expansion of the very system which we hold under suspicion.

Mr. TAFT. It would make it possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection it ought to be stated that the price control Administrator stated that the program contemplated by these figures up to this time could be roughly figured at \$268,000,000, and that probably \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 more would be necessary during the period, which would run the figure somewhat above the \$300,000,000 mark. It would probably reach \$318,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is in addition to the \$175,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So, in order to be on sound ground, the committee fixed the maximum at \$350,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. As I have said before, some subsidies are well justified. For instance, a subsidy for feed costs for dairy products is probably justified. We can never be sure when an emergency will arise, when a justifiable subsidy may be called for. As I have said, I do not know that \$350,000,000 is exactly the figure should be, but I do not think the difference is material.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before taking my seat I wish only to say that I have a number of minor amendments which were suggested almost entirely by the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to its powers. I will offer them before the amendment is voted on, but I will not do so at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio mind telling us now what the amendments are?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to show them to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Are they technical corrections?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to take them up with the Senator. I intend to describe them later. I prefer to postpone offering them for the time being.

Mr. AIKEN. Before the Senator takes his seat may I ask him whether he con-

siders that his amendment would limit the life of subsidies to a 6-month period, as the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be limited?

Mr. TAFT. It would limit subsidies except that if money is definitely allocated for subsidies before the 1st of January, in case of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they may be carried out after the 1st of January. In other words, it is intended to cover commitments beyond the 1st of January, within the sum specified.

Mr. AIKEN. Supposing commitments were made covering the next growing season, 1944?

Mr. TAFT. That is a question to be dealt with by one of the amendments which I shall explain later.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I find myself in much the same position of embarrassment as to what the Senator from Ohio and other Senators have pointed out. I shall not discuss the details of the joint resolution.

In my own mind I am thoroughly convinced that a general system of subsidies is dangerous to the economy of the country. I know very well that the slogan has been that it has worked very well in England and, therefore, it ought to work in the United States. I am convinced that it cannot work here as it has worked in England. I am convinced of that, and I hope I shall at least give a little gleam of an idea to Members who do me the honor of listening to me.

I wish to return to what I consider was the source of the subsidy idea, as well as many other foreign and domestic policies of this administration.

The administration's insistence on a food subsidy as an instrument of anti-inflation policy or price control is due mainly to the influence of British example and doctrine. The inner circle in Washington, made up of those who constantly see the President and advise him on policy and grand strategy—Harry Hopkins, Justice Frankfurter, and his former star pupils in the Harvard Law School, now his protégés in strategic Government positions, and the New Deal brain trust—this group is the real American Cabinet and War Council. It is they who formulate what are called "directives" which are passed on to the appropriate heads in the Army, Navy, and various other governmental agencies of wartime control. The latter translate these directives and policy decisions of the inner circle into grand strategy for the conduct of the war on the global front and for the conduct of the Nation's war efforts on the domestic front. This inner circle has as its intellectual pivots Justice Frankfurter in Washington and Prof. Harold J. Laski in London. The two governing characteristics of this inner circle are their strong tendencies to what, for brevity, may be called socialism and inflation, or cheap money, and to following recent and current British thought and experience.

Two recent or current examples of the working of this international team in the realm of higher American policy-making may be seen in our Treasury's announced plan for post-war monetary policy,



roughly paralleling, with minor differences, that of Lord Keynes, and in the administrations' insistent demands for the use of a food subsidy as an instrument of anti-inflation policy. Recently, Prof. Benjamin Anderson, in a public address on the Pacific coast, raised what was virtually a lone voice crying in the wilderness against both the Keynes or British Treasury, and the Morgenthau or American Treasury, schemes for post-war monetary management. Professor Anderson made the elementary point that the essence of both schemes or plans was cheap money and a rubber dollar.

In the case of food and price control or so-called antiinflation policy, the Washington inner circle shows again its dependence on British thinking and experimentation. The inner circle insists that food subsidies are the golden key to price stability, the sovereign panacea against inflation. That is what the whole policy is based upon. Their chief reason for such insistence on the use of food subsidies is the British example. Their reasoning is simple: if it has worked well for Britain, it must work well for us. The fallacy inheres in an obvious difference between the British and the American situations, a difference generally overlooked in press and radio discussions of the problem, and a difference which will be bluntly stated at this time. Incidentally, Washington, for propaganda reasons, wishes to have as little as possible mention of this difference. But, when Washington persistently invokes the British example in support of its demand for the use of the food subsidy, Washington must expect to have opponents invoke certain facts which are obvious on any comparison of the American and British situations.

Briefly, here is the big difference between America and Britain in all economic, fiscal, and monetary matters: Britain has a Santa Claus and America has not. Because Britain has a food Santa Claus, the British Government can give to British food growers and to food consumers, as an incentive to larger production by the food growers and as a preventive of higher food costs for workers with its corollary of higher wages, a money subsidy without creating an inflationary danger, provided such money subsidy does not exceed the value of the groceries which the American Santa Claus, officially known as lend-lease, gives the British Government in the same period.

Here are the facts: Last year we gave the British around two and one-half million tons of food worth about \$800,000,000. I read a statement in the press some time ago that it was more than that, but this is the last figure I have. This was about one-tenth of the total British food consumption. Now we are committed to keeping up these food deliveries as well as to giving Stalin three and one-tenth million tons, or over a billion dollars' worth of groceries. The British Government sold these \$800,000,000 worth of groceries to the British people, thus taking that much cash from the people. That is anti-inflationary. According to Lord Woolton, the British food

czar, the British Government in the same period used about \$500,000,000 of the \$800,000,000 it took in for the sale of American food to subsidize British food production and distribution, thereby keeping British food prices down and British food production up. Obviously, for a government to take in \$800,000,000 from its own people for food which did not cost it a penny and to pay out \$500,000,000 as a bonus or incentive to food production and preventive of food-price rise, is not inflationary. Quite the opposite. The British Government took in \$300,000,000 more in money than it put out. Thus the British food subsidy was in no sense inflationary. The reason why it was not inflationary was that an American Santa Claus gave the British people \$800,000,000 worth of groceries.

If a foreign Santa Claus would give the United States a billion dollars worth of groceries, which our Government forthwith sold to our people, taking a billion dollars in cash out of their pockets, our Government could then turn around and give back to American food growers and distributors a billion dollars to keep output up and prices down, as did the British Government. But if the United States Government pumps another billion dollars of money created by the commercial banks creating bank credit to buy Government bonds into the money stream to subsidize either food producers or food buyers, it is fairly certain that this injection of new money into the food market will prove inflationary, since it will be offset by no corresponding windfall of additional food.

The economic case against a food subsidy for the United States is irrefutable either on the basis of theoretical analysis or practical experimentation. The strongest point in this case is that the subsidy method is more expensive and less efficient and less just than the free-market method for bringing supply into balance with demand. We saw that in the last war. The subsidy method undertakes to induce food producers, processors, and distributors to produce, process, and distribute more without the incentive of a higher market price.

To operate a subsidy system you need an army of Government agents and mountains of paper work, investigation, control, and policing. Suppose the farmer is paid a cash bonus for producing more than he produced last year; then each farmer's statement must be checked and double-checked by special investigators. If the farmer is paid a bonus on what he sells, the administrative costs will still be enormous. Such subsidies, to produce appreciable results in the way of increased output, would have to be astronomical in total amount. A governmental subsidy of a few cents a pound on butter would have little effect on total output. Nor would it enable the poor man to compete with the rich patron of the food bootlegger for the available scarce supply. In the bootleg market the rich consumer is prepared to bid not 3 or 5 or even 10 cents more a pound, but 20 or 30 cents.

A food subsidy, to get results, that is, increased output above present levels,

would have to be fabulous in total amount and hence wildly inflationary unless entirely successful in achieving a corresponding increase in output. A subsidy big enough to induce increased food output would present staggering administrative and enforcement problems. Such problems can only be solved by a totalitarian dictatorship proceeding along lines now well established by the Soviet and Nazi precedents in similar government undertakings. To toss a few hundred millions of Government money into the present food markets as a supposed inducement to greater output and preventive of higher prices would be a futile gesture.

It must be clearly understood that any government undertaking to operate a substitute system for the law of supply and demand or for the free market is bound to break down unless conducted with the utter thoroughness and ruthlessness of the totalitarian states. The reason why, as explained at length, is that the British seem to furnish an example, refuting the generalization just stated; the British economy is being, and has been now for over a decade, heavily subsidized by the United States through our purchase of over \$15,000,000,000 of gold from 1933 to 1941 and now by lease-lend. To control prices and production, to control otherwise than through the free market, the state must either bribe or coerce. Trying to bribe with cash subsidies, to succeed, must be wildly inflationary—unless, as in the case of Britain, of course, it is possible to get a huge subsidy from abroad free gratis. To coerce larger output requires inevitably a set-up like that of Soviet Russia. A mild regime of attempted price and production control must break down for much the same reasons prohibition broke down. Effective enforcement is impossible under such a mild regime.

Right now millions of tons of meat are sold to restaurants and hotels above the ceiling prices. The procedure is simple and almost detection-proof. The meat is Government inspected. The quantities delivered are sold at the ceiling price, as is attested by a bill of sale and a check in payment—all for the O. P. A. record. But an additional sum is paid in cash by the buyer to the seller on delivery.

Once traffic in food develops along bootleg lines, the chief losers are primary producers and ultimate consumers and those distributors, storekeepers, or restaurant keepers who, as a practical matter or for moral scruples, cannot or will not indulge in such transactions. There are just two ways to eliminate bootlegging: One is the free market, and the other is the totalitarian way, with an omnipresent Gestapo. A few hundred million dollars subsidy to food growers, processors, and consumers, however dispensed or administered, simply would not touch the roots of the food bootleg market.

A great many monetary, fiscal, and economic measures taken by the British Government over the past 10 years, or since the New Deal jumped the price of gold 70 percent, from \$20.67 to \$35 an

ounce, have been either inflationary or socialistic or both. Yet these measures have not had inflationary results or sequels, nor have they required the controls and disciplines which usually go with drastic ventures in state socialism. The popular notion in America, especially in conservative circles or among the so-called best people who have a great cult of Britain, is that such measures when taken by the British are sound or conservative and are neither inflationary nor socialistic in character. The real explanation is almost never stated, and it is apparently understood by very few Americans.

The explanation is that now for a decade the United States has been playing Santa Claus to the British Empire to the tune of around a billion dollars a year. This we did for 7 years by the purchase of over \$10,000,000,000 of gold from the British Empire, the producer of two-thirds of the yearly output of gold of the entire world, and for the past 2 years by lend-lease. By stepping up the price of gold 70 percent and purchasing \$15,000,000,000 of gold from 1933 to 1942, two-thirds of which we bought from the British Empire, and by selling American foodstuffs and raw materials some 20 to 30 percent below the prices of the 1920's, we made a present to the British Empire each year of several hundred million dollars. This subsidy enabled the British to enjoy the boons of inflation and socialism without undergoing the usual consequences or paying the usual costs. It is all very simple when one stops to consider what actually happened. If one borrows money to go on a spending spree one soon runs into the troubles of anyone who gets head over heels in debt. But if one has a spending spree on a succession of gifts or legacies by friends or relatives one obviously experiences none of the troubles of the embarrassed debtor or the spendthrift.

The American Santa Claus has made inflation and state socialism safe and practically without cost for the British economy. It does not follow, however, that the same measures and policies can be carried out by a nation like the United States without a corresponding subsidy from abroad and without the costs and consequences which such measures and policies normally involve.

The British have got away with inflation and socialistic measures without the usual costs and sequels, simply because the United States has been subsidizing the British economy for the past 10 years to the tune of several hundred million dollars a year through purchases of gold at 70 percent more than it is worth (or costs to produce) and, more recently, through outright gifts in the form of lease-lend.

To point this out is not to criticize our gold-buying policy, lease-lend, or the inflationary and socialistic policies and practices which our subsidies made safe and easy for the British. It is merely to state an obvious, though little recognized fact. The moral is that America cannot imitate the British in inflationary and socialistic policies and practices with the same results or lack of results encount-

ered in the British experiments with inflation and socialism since 1932. If we go in for such policies and practices, we must expect to be obliged to use the same procedures which similar policies and practices have imposed on Soviet Russia, where they did not have their state investment and socialism program subsidized by foreign gifts. A foreign subsidy to enable the United States to go in for inflation and socialism as Britain has done without suffering the usual consequences, would have to be three times as large as the billion dollar a year subsidy we have been giving the British Empire since we started paying \$35 an ounce for gold instead of \$20.67.

We are three times as large in population. But we, instead of receiving a subsidy from foreign sources, are committed to feeding and financing the British, Russian, and Chinese Empires during an indefinite period of war and post-war world reconstruction. With these commitments, our Government cannot give money subsidies to producers and consumers without inviting the direst evils of inflation. With these commitments, our country cannot continue paying high prices to labor or keep high profits and raise or even maintain present living standards. The British Government, thanks to the subsidies of the American high price in buying gold and low price in selling food, was able to come out of the depression, not by lowering costs and the selling price of British exports, but by raising British living standards and improving British housing. Even during the present war, thanks to American lease-lend, the British Government has been able to improve the diet of the poorest half of the British population.

While it is the Keynes and Laskis in Britain who best explain or rationalize the inflationary and socialistic tendencies in British policy since 1933, it has been the Baldwins, Chamberlains, and Churchills, or the most traditional of Tories, who have had the direction of public affairs while these policies have been carried out. These conservative leaders have been neither inflationists nor Socialists. They have been hard-headed British imperialists. They merely perceived the dispositions of American policy and made obvious adjustments. I admire the British for their astuteness, and for many other qualities they possess. There was no use trying to lower British production costs with a view to expanding exports to America.

A protectionist American Congress would raise the tariff to offset any reduction of British production costs. Americans did not want to buy British manufactures cheap. They wanted to sell American food products cheap and buy British gold dear. Now they want to give away American food products. The proper British adjustment was to sell American gold for 70 percent more than it was worth and to buy cheap or to receive as a gift American groceries. This required, among other things, inflationary and socialist policies in Britain in order to increase British purchasing and consuming power. It has raised American taxes and public debt and raised

British living standards. It has been sound for British capitalism, or at least safe, so far, because, thanks to our subsidies, inflation there has not taken.

In the long run these developments are calculated to lessen the recently growing economic superiority of the United States over Britain. This leveling process, as between Britain and America is grand for Britain. It will be accelerated to whatever extent American policymakers, under the influence of British thought and example, attempt to imitate British measures of a socialistic or inflationary nature. For, while inflationary and socialistic policies enabled Britain to make adjustment to American policies of buying gold dear and selling food cheap, and now giving it away, the same or similar policies followed by our Government are justified by no such necessity of making adjustment to the policy of a powerful foreign nation, and are subsidized by no such gifts as our gold-buying and lease-lend operations involved.

If, in pursuing a grandiose program of world uplift and socialism, the United States resorts to inflation, by giving money subsidies to producers and consumers, instead of relying, as did socialist Russia, on harsh discipline, compulsion, and purges, it is a foregone conclusion that resort to prolonged inflation will wreck the American capitalist economy without, at the same time, building a strong self-sufficient socialist economy. Briefly, what was sound for Britain will not be sound or feasible for the United States, because, in international economic relations, the United States is not, like Britain, the recipient of foreign subsidies, but is trying to be the subsidizer of half the globe. A subsidy-receiving national economy must inflate to make satisfactory adjustment to the receipt from abroad of a subsidy. Such inflation is not inflationary in its effects but merely a matter of adjustment.

A subsidy-giving national economy cannot inflate without disastrous consequences. The formula for subsidy giving is not inflation but self-denial and harsh discipline. But British long-run interests will be well served if current developments result in a leveling down of America and a leveling up of Britain for the post-war economic race. Nothing will better insure this post-war result than an American attempt to imitate certain inflationary procedures recently used with success and without inflationary sequels by the British.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 9, on page 2.

**Mr. O'MAHONEY.** Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated. The amendment is merely to cast into proper language the amendment I discussed earlier in the afternoon.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** In the committee amendment on page 5, line 6, following the word "law", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the



word "products" in line 13, and between lines 13 and 14 to insert the following new subsection:

(g) No subsidy program shall be undertaken or continued with respect to any agricultural commodity either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, if in its opinion such program will result in any reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall each issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity as a result of any such subsidy program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield to me, let me say that I think if he will modify his amendment by striking out the word "such" in the last line he will strengthen it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator, and I modify my amendment in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the modification, I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming on what basis he determines the prices below which no reduction would be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They would be the prices existing at the time when the program went into effect. It must necessarily be so. Much as I should like to go back to the basis stated in the bill which was vetoed, because of the notice I have received on the floor this afternoon that any attempt to do so would result in a veto, I now am working on the basis of the old theory that one-tenth of a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat, I should like to ask him a further question. If we are to provide for the price as of the date of the enactment of the joint resolution, that price may be below the support price already offered by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. For example, if my recollection is correct, and I am stating this from memory, the Secretary of Agriculture offered a support price for hogs, at Chicago, of \$13.75 per hundred pounds. On the 15th of June, which is the date for the figures given in the last issue of the official publication of the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Prices, dated June 29, and stamped as received in my office on July 1, the price of hogs in Chicago was \$13.60, already 15 cents below the support price offered by the Secretary of Agriculture, as I recall the figures. Let me inquire of the Senator from Wyoming whether he would further reduce that price, or would retain the market

price of that date or of some other date, and disregard the support price already offered to increase production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, I think the support price is a matter of procedure and accepted policy at the present time, and would not be affected. The Senator from Kansas well knows that I did not agree with the philosophy or the method of procedure which was outlined in the Emergency Price Control Act. I felt that very different steps should have been taken. However, they were not taken.

I offer the amendment to the amendment in the belief that it is an improvement over the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming whether he is willing to turn his livestock producers over to the tender mercies of the O. P. A.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. REED. Or whether he thinks his livestock producers, any more than those of Kansas, would care to be turned over to the tender mercies of the O. P. A.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The Senator and I still agree.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In reading the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, I notice he leaves the question of whether there will be a reduction in price to the opinion of the O. P. A. or the R. F. C.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no other way to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Wyoming that the officials of the executive department maintained, when they announced the roll-back subsidy on meat and dairy products, that prices to the farmers would not be reduced?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my opinion is that the amendment would result in an improvement over the present position. I have in mind that the President in his veto message used the following sentence:

I do not intend to permit farm prices and farm incomes to be depressed.

I may feel, and I do feel, that this method is the incorrect approach to the problem. However, we are confronted by the substantial fact that the House of Representatives declined to override the President's veto. Therefore, as I see the situation from a practical point of view, I have no recourse but to do the best I can do now to obtain acceptance of modifications which will tend to improve the situation and which will make it more and more clear that the intent of Congress and the intent of the Executive is that the matter shall be administered in such fashion as not to depress farm prices and thereby curtail the opportunity of the producer to produce.

I am hopeful that it will still dawn upon those who are handling the program that a much better method of maintaining production can be followed than the one which is being followed by these programs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming will recall that in the message the President delivered to this body on Labor Day of last year, he offered an alternative method of determining prices of farm products. The plan offered was that the prices should be either the parity price or the highest price paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942.

I am also sure the Senator from Wyoming will remember that the administrative agencies undertook to reduce prices which already were below the maximum price paid between January 1 and September 15. I happen to have in my office an analysis of that situation. Not anticipating that the matter would come up this afternoon, I do not happen to have the analysis at hand, but I am quite sure I have correctly stated the situation, namely, that some of the so-called price roll-back orders are reducing farm prices which already are below the prices which should be maintained under the President's message of Labor Day of last year. How are the livestock producers and how are the farmers to secure protection under circumstances such as those, when the President holds out a program under which it is easy to determine maximum prices, and then his own administrative agencies reduce prices which already are below that maximum?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a few brief statements which I think will contribute toward the interpretation of the problems which may face the administrators of the law a little later.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now, as for the subsidy problem. It is another one of those deals where they don't tell the whole truth. Either that or they do not know. If Congress allows the meat industry to be subsidized, it is the beginning of the ruination of the whole economy of this country. It seems simple offhand to subsidize the packer so as to maintain present live prices. If the subsidy program as proposed is allowed to go through, we will immediately have ordered maximum live prices on the various grades of livestock, because otherwise it would be impossible to determine what the cost of the subsidy program would be because the packers, knowing that they were being subsidized, would not care what price they paid for livestock. So maximum live prices would be absolutely necessary, and when maximum live prices are placed on livestock, then follows allocation to the packer.

The livestock industry has made a mistake in the past by talking about the price of livestock rather than cost of production. The Corn Belt feeder is the only individual contributing to our war effort who is asked to produce his product and sell it below cost of production.

	Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Lot 5	Lot 6	Lot 7
Number head.....	72	195	108	146	416	123	196
Total purchase weight.....pounds..	61,730	140,665	127,670	160,120	410,077	146,610	190,072
Average.....do.....	857	721	1,182	1,097	985	1,191	970
Total feeding days.....	3,220	13,065	7,960	10,320	41,351	8,635	11,407
Gain per day.....pounds.....	2.09	1.9	2.5	2.07	2.07	2.9	2.02
General overhead—labor including grinding per head.....	\$0.03½	\$0.03½	\$0.03½	\$0.03½	\$0.03½	\$0.03½	\$0.03½
Total labor overhead.....	\$112.70	\$457.27	\$278.60	\$361.20	\$1,447.28	\$302.22	\$399.24
Interest per head.....	\$0.01½	\$0.01½	\$0.01½	\$0.01½	\$0.01½	\$0.01½	\$0.01½
Total interest charge.....	\$48.30	\$195.97	\$119.40	\$159.30	\$620.26	\$129.52	\$171.10
Feeding costs:							
Corn, shelled.....	\$842.00	\$3,600.00	\$3,055.00	\$3,100.00	\$14,976.50	\$3,521.70	\$3,443.00
Corn, ear.....	\$115.28	\$458.80	\$292.50	\$331.00			
Hay.....							
Alfalfa.....	\$37.31	\$148.56	\$94.72	\$107.12			
Prairie.....	\$29.25	\$116.44	\$74.24	\$83.96	\$1,594.25	\$369.91	\$475.77
Linseed meal.....					\$1,005.36	\$211.78	\$262.56
Cotton cake.....					\$970.94	\$212.52	\$245.44
Linsoy.....	\$156.47	\$592.06	\$371.18	\$503.71			
Molasses.....					\$550.19	\$117.07	\$148.05
Mineral.....	\$12.24	\$59.58	\$23.76	\$33.00			
Total sale weight.....pounds.....	68,460	165,450	147,520	179,660	490,644	171,650	213,120
Total gain.....do.....	6,730	24,785	19,850	19,540	85,567	25,040	23,048
Total cost gain.....	\$1,353.55	\$5,628.69	\$4,309.40	\$4,674.79	\$21,165.18	\$5,145.16	\$4,864.72
Cost per pound gain.....	\$0.201	\$0.227	\$0.217	\$0.239	\$0.247	\$0.194	\$0.223
Feed cost, lots 1, 2, 3, 4:							
Corn, shelled, per bushel.....	\$1.00						
Corn, ear, per bushel.....	1.00						
Hay.....							
Alfalfa, per ton.....	18.50						
Prairie, per ton.....	14.50						
Linsoy, per ton.....	57.00						
Mineral, per hundredweight.....	6.00						
Food cost on lots 5, 6, 7:							
Corn, shelled, per bushel.....							\$0.96½
Hay, per ton.....							15.50
Linseed meal, per ton.....							43.00
Cotton cake, per ton.....							62.00
Molasses, per ton.....							29.00

With respect to the Office of Price Administration action to roll back prices on hogs, cattle, and other farm products, I wish to say the only answer is for us farmers to produce less, because our cost has increased. I am willing to work for the boys for nothing but I have to pay my help and my bank. The authorities in Washington have threatened us stockmen with everything they can think of (I hope), and have charged us farmers with causing inflation and the high cost of living. I don't like it and my neighbors around here don't like it. We are working 7 days a week and trying to make enough food but there are so many to eat that I am afraid we won't make it.

It takes the heart out of a man when he comes in dog tired at night and reads about these Washington ideas to roll back farm prices, subsidize the packers, and increase wages to organized labor.

Sorry to bother you, but this is about the picture here and I sincerely believe food production is in danger—or do they want food produced?

HON. HUGH BUTLER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the way the farmers are taking the treatment that they are getting. There is no other class that is getting the kind of deal the farmer is at the present time.

I have 22 gilts bred for June farrow, and I am going to sell them before they show to piggle, and that is the way the most of the farmers in Fair Dale Precinct are going to do. I am the assessor, Victory leader, and committeeman of this precinct. I have contacted 90 farmers in the last 3 days, so I know how they feel.

Most anybody can go to Grand Island and make from 10 to 18 dollars a day in the plant, and labor is impossible to get. Everybody but the farmer gets paid on a cost-plus basis. Farmers' pay is based on a parity that dates back to the time when wages of labor were far less.

I wish I had the time to write you a long letter, but this is what is going to happen. In about 6 to 8 months they are going to wonder where all the meat is that farmers signed up to raise. If the bunch that is running this show want grain instead of meat, that is just what they are going to get.

The price the farmer was getting for his produce was not too high in regard to other classes. It's been too cheap, and when it reached a closer ratio it seemed high to labor who has been used to cheap food. Don't

Rosie know labor gets more money to spend than all the farmers together. I mean net money or inflation money, if I must; are not you boys going to do something for us?

I am yours very truly.

SEARLE BROS. RANCH,  
Ogallala, Nebr., April 15, 1943.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am mailing you a letter which I wish could be gotten to the heads of the Office of Price Administration, as it very clearly shows the situation out in this country.

I would have sent it direct, but did not think it would ever reach the right parties.

I am very patriotic as the letter suggests and all the cattle folks are, but when we stand to lose the price of our feed and labor and very likely a part of our investment in the cattle, we don't feel like pitching.

Yours very truly,

A. L. SEARLE.

UNION STOCK YARDS,  
Denver, Colo., April 13, 1943.

DEAR SIR: Livestock markets have been pretty much upset this week at all points, the result of news emanating from Washington, D. C., most of which came out of Office of Price Administration and from the new food administrator, Chester Davis. The advance of 5 cents per bushel in the price of corn, ordered by Mr. Davis along with his drastic crack-down threats of different things that were being considered to lower the price of beef and pork, naturally has made livestock growers and livestock feeders more uneasy than they have been for some time and justly so. To raise the price of grains and lower the price of livestock cuts pretty sharply into the bank accounts of our meat producers at the moment.

It is our opinion that the well being of the Nation is jeopardized seriously by these intermittent announcements, having to do with meat production and all of which for 8 to 10 months have resulted in a curtailment of production, whereas the needs of the Army, the needs of lend-lease and the needs of the civilian population of our country demand that more meat, not less, be produced.

We feel that the tinkering going on by men who are not familiar with livestock production problems, will only result eventually in a condition that will have to be remedied in some way, or else meat, so sorely needed, simply will not be available.

Having an abiding confidence in the intelligence of the American people as a whole, it is our opinion that necessary corrections will be made as times goes on, with the result that more experienced and practical folks will be at the head of our gigantic factory of meat production in the United States. Therefore we feel like assuring producers that anything working against their interests will be temporary; do not get alarmed; stay in there and pitch; run your plant to capacity, and figure that you are simply doing your part in the interest of the country that we love, even though hampered by rules and regulations not at all practical and not serving the public interest the least bit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who reported the joint resolution, if, in his opinion, there is any authorization in the joint resolution for placing ceiling prices on live animals?

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would authorize placing ceiling prices on live animals. In that respect I think it would not change the power in the present law. Yesterday Mr. Brown, the Price Administrator, appeared before our committee and stated that it was the policy of the administration not to place prices on live animals. I believe that if he were permitted to carry out the program he has in hand he would maintain that policy. If he is driven away from the program which he is conducting he might be forced to seek alternatives to the fixing of prices on live animals.

Mr. BUTLER. It is in anticipation that something like that might develop that I have had inserted in the Record a few quotations from the statements to which I have already referred. I invite especial attention to one page covering the complete cost of finishing seven lots of cattle which were on feed. The statement shows the number of days, the feed which was weighed into them, the labor costs, and everything else in connection with the complete transaction. If it is desired, I can obtain affidavits in support of the figures showing



the actual cost of producing beef at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified, to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 5 is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in our last conference with Mr. Hutson, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, he asked for certain modifications of language, and one modification of substance. I therefore offer the first amendment which has been requested and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. May the amendment be stated first?

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the word "Corporation" it is proposed to insert "or the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, these amendments are important. Hearing them read, without having them before us, leaves us in a state of uncertainty as to what the amendments actually mean. I suggest to the majority leader and to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that in the interest of intelligent handling of these very important questions the amendments ought to be printed and made available to Senators. We ought not to undertake to vote on them this afternoon. I suggest to the majority leader that we should not undertake to vote on these amendments, or any part of the bill, tonight. The amendments should be made available so that we may have them before us and give them the intelligent consideration which their importance deserves.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this particular amendment is purely technical. There is one other of that nature. There is one amendment of some importance, to which I think the Senator's remarks would apply. I should like to get rid of the technical amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that most of these amendments are purely technical, with one exception. There is one substantive amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it would be agreeable to permit the Senator from Ohio to perfect his amendment with these suggestions and have the entire amendment printed in the final form in which he intends to offer it, so that it may be available to Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not offering any amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator is offering amendments to the committee amendment. It is not as though he were offering an amendment from the floor, which he could perfect as a matter of right.

Mr. REED. That is the point I wish to have made clear. If it is only a question of perfecting the committee amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the committee amendment, or any other amendment to the joint resolution, is adopted, it must go back to the House. Whether the House would feel disposed to act on the amendment without sending it to conference, I have no way of knowing. If it had to go to conference, that would mean some time. It is important to have the joint resolution enacted into law as soon as possible. The Commodity Credit Corporation is now out of business. Its time expired 5 days ago, and technically, it cannot transact any business until its life has been extended.

I do not wish to crowd Senators to vote tonight, although I had hoped that we might dispose of the joint resolution tonight in order to send it to the House as soon as possible, so that it might be acted upon one way or the other.

I am willing to accommodate myself to what the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desire. Two or three Senators have indicated that they wish to make brief observations or propound certain inquiries with respect to the general subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is important that the joint resolution be disposed of at a reasonably early hour tomorrow so that it may reach the House and the House may appoint a conference committee tomorrow, and so that action on the joint resolution may be completed on Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to suggest that if we are not to act tonight, I hope we can meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I should like to propose a limitation on further debate on the joint resolution and all amendments, if that is agreeable.

Mr. AIKEN. What limitation, Mr. President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. AIKEN. The joint resolution and any amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution or any amendment. That means that a Senator may speak 15 minutes on the joint resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Ohio tender the amendments which he intends to offer, so that they may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now submit the amendments intended to be proposed by me, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed and lie on the table, and also be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT were ordered to be printed and lie on the table, and also to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Strike out on page 5, lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and on page 6, lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(j) Nothing in this act shall be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination or any restriction of the use of trade and brand names; (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity; (3) as authorizing the Administrator to standardize any commodity, unless the Administrator shall determine, with respect to such standardization, that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity; or (4) as authorizing any order of the Administrator fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were prior to such order, in substantial use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency."

On page 4, line 2, after the word "or", to strike out the word "purchase" and insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

On page 4, lines 13 and 14, after the word "or", to strike out the word "purchase" and insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

On page 4, line 17, after the word "purpose" insert the word "not fulfilled prior to July 1, 1943."

On page 4, at the end of paragraph (d) strike out the period, insert a colon and the following "Provided, That commitments in a total additional sum of \$175,000,000 may be entered into prior to January 1, 1944, covering 1944 crops."

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that in view of the agreement which has been reached we may suspend at this time. I wonder if we can first dispose of the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which is pending. It is technical in nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, on page 3, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I inquire what has become of the "convincer" amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that amendment was agreed to while the Senator from Michigan was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Because of the consideration of the joint resolution before the Senate I did not make an effort to press for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 71, which was unanimously agreed to by the committee earlier in the day. However, I give notice that immediately upon the disposition of the pending measure tomorrow, I shall ask for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 71.

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when the calendar was called a few days ago,

and Calendar No. 341, Senate Joint Resolution 59 was reached, I asked for an explanation. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the author of the joint resolution, was not present, and no Senator seemed to be in a position to explain the joint resolution.

I have since looked into the subject; and not only have I no objection to the joint resolution, but I think it is an entirely worthy measure. It would simply authorize and request the President to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day during the year 1943. Therefore, I desire to withdraw the objection which I then urged, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the proposal for the Armed Services Honor Day limited to 1943?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 59.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "the," to strike out "20th" and insert "1st."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, same line, after the word "of," to strike out "June" and insert "August."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That Sunday, the 1st day of August 1943, be, and hereby is, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition and the honoring of all men and women who have served or now are serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America.

That the civil, religious, educational, and patriotic authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and that they arrange and hold appropriate ceremonies in their respective communities in honor of all members of the United States of America armed forces and particularly the national defenders from the States and localities in which they reside.

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby are, authorized to recommend participation by military

and naval forces under their respective jurisdiction in ceremonies marking the occasion of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent that is consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to prepare and transmit a message to all of our armed forces everywhere and especially to those heroes who have come from the scenes of battle to recover from their wounds or illnesses expressing the Commander in Chief's and the Nation's gratitude and voicing our prayers for a final and complete victory and their safe return to the pursuits of civil life in a world at peace.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the committee has reported certain amendments to the preamble.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that the preamble be eliminated. It is a long preamble, and it has been customary to eliminate long preambles. I do not think a preamble is essential.

Mr. WILEY. The elimination of the preamble is satisfactory to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the preamble is eliminated.

#### HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the completion of the pending business the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2936, Calendar 387, an act to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the bill?

Mr. WHITE. May we have an explanation of the purpose of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2936), to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense" and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, allow me to say in answer to the question of the acting minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], that the bill would authorize an additional \$200,000,000 under the Lanham Act to be used for community facilities, principally in connection with new housing which the Congress has recently authorized in the amount of \$400,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that I have no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to submit an inquiry to the Senator from Connecticut. In the second deficiency appropriation bill which the Senate passed this afternoon there is an item of \$75,000,000 for facilities for this matter.

Mr. MALONEY. It is in connection with the proposal and would be available only if this particular bill should pass.

Mr. GEORGE. This is a mere authorization? There is no proposal to appropriate the money at this time?

Mr. MALONEY. The \$75,000,000 to which the Senator refers would be available only upon the enactment of this bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I was anxious to understand it clearly because on the Mississippi coast there are many hundreds of units of houses which are actually unoccupied and yet we have continued to appropriate money for additional construction.

Mr. WHITE. Is this the legislative authority for the appropriation of \$75,000,000 which the Senate adopted this afternoon? Did that appropriation rest on the assumption that this measure was to pass?

Mr. MALONEY. That is to provide some of the money should this bill pass.

Mr. WHITE. That is, the appropriation was contingent upon the passage of this bill.

Mr. MALONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator is familiar with the objection which I made to the bill. My recollection is that there were objections from other Senators who are not now present. Am I incorrect as to that?

Mr. MALONEY. I want to be sure I understand what the Senator means by his objection. The objection to which I refer, as voiced by the Senator from Michigan, was that he did not want to enlarge the powers of the Federal Department of Education through this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, on the contrary I voiced the objection of the Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction of Michigan to the direct contact of the Federal Works Agency in circulating these funds direct to school districts in Michigan. I quote him literally:

We therefore recommend that the act be further amended so that all funds for school instruction and maintenance and operation be channeled through the United States Office of Education and in turn through the State Departments of Education.

Mr. MALONEY. That would not take place under this language.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I judge not.

Mr. MALONEY. I myself disagree with that view, I must say to the Senator. This would authorize the Federal Works Agency to continue the program which has been in effect for a long time and would not in any way change it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, it permits the Federal Works Agency to deal directly with school districts.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the educational authorities of the State of Michigan, at least, are fundamentally opposed to the maintenance of that sort of a contact.

Mr. MALONEY. I am not familiar with all the views of the Michigan authorities, but I talked with the man who is superintendent of education, or who



holds an important State position comparable to it, and he explained a situation which exists at Willow Run, which I understand, has been or is about to be adjusted. Beyond that, I do not know the views of the Michigan authorities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why should not these funds at least be channeled through the State educational authorities of the various States even if we want to by-pass the United States Office of Education?

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot answer that question. I presume that the authority to do that rests with the Federal Works Agency. If they do not do that I presume it is because they feel that the matter can be more expeditiously handled through the local authorities, who are entirely familiar with the particular situation and who under ordinary circumstances would be charged with the raising of funds to construct schools which are in whole or in part provided for by this legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Michigan, with the permission of the Senator from Connecticut, that in my opinion the bill which passed the Senate recently, namely, Senate bill 1130, was expected to give the State educational authorities participation in working out a State program which would meet, in my judgment, many of the objections raised in the letter to which the Senator from Michigan has referred.

Mr. MALONEY. So that the Senator from Michigan may be a little more fully informed, let me say that we made provision in the bill which we are discussing to turn the activities over to the United States Office of Education under the so-called Thomas bill, which has already passed the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall not interfere with the Senator's anxiety to pass the bill because I know of the fundamental necessity for the expansion of what we might call municipal facilities in connection with the defense needs. However, I now ask the question if the other Senators who objected to this bill are present?

Mr. MALONEY. The only other Senator I knew had an objection is the Senator from Wisconsin. He just left the Chamber. I know of no other objection. The bill was reported by the committee unanimously, as I recall. It is not my proposal. It is a House bill and I am merely acting in the capacity of chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator object to the amendment which would require the Federal Works Agency to consult the State authorities in the various States?

Mr. MALONEY. That has already been provided. That is the practice of the Federal Works Agency. They do consult the Federal Office of Education and consequently the State authorities.

The Senator from Connecticut would object to any amendment which would compel them to do that, because it might cause some delay. The matter has already been passed upon by the Senate. I assume the Senator from Michigan

voted for it. The Thomas bill would do just what the Senator wants done, and it is now before the House. Provision is made in this bill to avoid duplication. Should the so-called Thomas bill become law, the educational and day-care activities now being handled by the Federal Works Agency would be turned over to the Office of Education.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I recall that, and I favored it completely, of course, but it seems to me this is a violation of that method of procedure.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think this bill violates any procedure. It merely authorizes another \$200,000,000 to permit the authorities to do what they have been doing from the beginning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there anything about the passage of the Thomas bill which would affect the bill now being discussed?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; it would take out from the Federal Works Agency the operation of Federally-financed educational activities, and would so operate insofar as so-called child day-care centers are concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it would still permit the Federal Works Agency to arrange for the school instruction?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct, and I did not know anyone objected to that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do; but I resign, in the presence of the Senator's presentation of the case.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. An opportunity will be had tomorrow, I understand, to discuss this matter. The Senator does not intend to try to press for action on the bill today?

Mr. MALONEY. No, Mr. President; I asked unanimous consent that the bill might be considered on the completion of the pending business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very sorry I interrupted the Senator. I understood his request was for immediate passage, and I thought it was a rather summary proceeding.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sure the Presiding Officer understood me, and I know the majority leader did.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES IN MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Post Office Department has been designating for some time various postal employees to go to military camps and other places where military and naval personnel are concentrated, to look after the mail at those points. Out of its miscellaneous fund the Department has been paying these men their expenses, which averaged about \$2.60 a day. The General Accounting Office had the matter brought to its attention, and held that under the present law such payments could not be made, that an act would be required giving the Department authority to make them. The detailing of these

men is a very necessary and proper step for the Department to take. It is the cheapest way in which the matter can be handled.

The Post Office Department has presented a bill which provides that these men may be sent out. The first bill presented allowed a per diem of \$6. I told the Department that was entirely too much, and that I would not ask unanimous consent to have a bill passed unless the per diem were reduced. Finally, after several conferences, they presented a bill authorizing allowances at not exceeding \$2.50 a day, so as to make them conform with the actual expenses of the employees going to the various camps and doing the work I have indicated.

I should like permission to introduce the bill, and I shall then ask to have it taken up for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval personnel at military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units, at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding \$2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices."

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for any payments heretofore made not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to the employees so detailed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that this merely proposes to authorize the Post Office Department for a limited period of time—

Mr. McKELLAR. It is limited to 6 months after the war.

Mr. WHITE. To send out from the main offices of the Post Office Department trained and experienced personnel in order to assist in the handling of mail at the various military posts throughout the country?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is accurate in his statement.

Mr. WHITE. There is a limit upon the per diem and subsistence payments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The second section validates the Post Office Department action in doing this. It does not appropriate any more money. The payments are to be made out of the miscellaneous fund.

Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to say that the bill has not gone to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, because we have not had time, and we would not have time, to have a meeting of the committee and pass upon it. The bill is introduced entirely as a

result of a ruling of the Comptroller General, which I think was handed down either this morning or yesterday, as my memory serves me. That is why I am making the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### VISIT BY SENATORS TO THE WAR FRONT

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which has been released to the press. It gives his observations on the contemplated trip of other Senators to the battle front.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was charged by the Senate with the duty of checking on all phases of war production, for the purpose of making certain that we get to the fighting fronts as soon and as economically as possible the weapons, supplies, and facilities needed by our armed forces.

The Congress has a clear duty, for which the people will hold it responsible, to see that results are obtained from the billions of dollars appropriated for the war effort.

To fulfill these obligations, the committee has conducted numerous investigations in this country. Much time and effort were expended by its individual members, outside of their other duties as Senators, in holding interviews, conferences with officials representing industry, labor, and governmental agencies and hearings, both public and private, and in making on-the-ground inspections of plants. Much valuable evidence has been accumulated in this way, and forms the basis for many of the reports which have been filed with the Senate.

The committee is gratified that its efforts and achievements have been accepted by the public as beneficial to the effective prosecution of the war.

This work will be continued but the committee believes that it is not enough just to follow the goods to the country's borders. There must also be assurance that such goods reach the fighting fronts quickly and in good condition, and that they are, in fact, what the fighting forces have asked for and need. Also there must be assurance that the vast sums which are being expended abroad for airfields, harbor, and rail facilities and the like are economically spent to the end that the initial cost be kept to a minimum and that this country obtain therefrom the maximum possible post-war benefit and international good will.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, are going abroad with a group of other Senators during the period when Congress expects to be in recess and most of its Members are enjoying the first chance in several years to attend to their personal affairs. The committee has directed Senators MEAD and BREWSTER to obtain information—and, upon their return, to report to the committee—on the foreign aspects of the various questions which have been the subject of study by the committee, including particularly:

1. Transportation and supply by sea, air, highway, and rail;

2. Landing facilities in foreign areas developed by the United States and the rights of this country in those facilities now and in the post-war period;

3. Administrative activities in foreign fields outside military lines and particularly any confusion of function with respect thereto;

4. Arrangements for the distribution of American supplies among civilian populations;

5. Quality and condition of repair and replacement parts, including engines received from the United States, and quantity or percentage found unusable by reason of faulty manufacture;

6. The function of the Office of War Information.

It is especially important that the Congress acquaint itself now with the arrangements which are being made abroad in the name of the United States by the numerous representatives of the many special agencies authorized to expend funds and to distribute American property. The time to correct mistakes is at their inception. The time to obtain equitable settlements of our post-war rights to use airfields and other properties built and paid for by us is now. We must do our utmost to win the war speedily and also to contribute our full share to a post-war atmosphere that will be conducive to an enduring peace. The committee desires to make certain that proper attention is being given to these matters by those charged with the responsibility for them.

The committee has no jurisdiction over military strategy or tactics and has never addressed inquiries into this field. This practice will be continued.

Upon their return they will render a full report to the committee as to the facts ascertained by them.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committee, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James T. Black to be area director, Dallas area office, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. A few days ago this nomination was passed over at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. The objection is withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lester G. Graham to be senior manpower utilization consultant, El Paso area office, which had previously been passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ellen S. Woodward to be a member of the Social Security Board.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today. That completes the Executive Calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 6, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

Francis G. Rowland, Childersburg, Ala., in place of F. G. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nora W. Hill, Ramer, Ala., in place of R. F. Cowles, resigned.

##### ALASKA

Charles H. Hope, Unalaska, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

##### ARIZONA

Eva L. Wheeler, Nogales, Ariz., in place of E. D. Miller, deceased.

##### ARKANSAS

Alonzo D. McAllister, Fayetteville, Ark., in place of A. M. Wilson, deceased.

Donald B. McCluney, Rector, Ark., in place of Martha Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

##### CALIFORNIA

Lora Belle Fearhelly, Linden, Calif., in place of J. A. Drace, resigned.

Alberta Frankamp, Novato, Calif., in place of M. M. Evers. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

Clarence C. Foulk, Pacoima, Calif., in place of J. A. Dinkler, resigned.

June E. James, Robbins, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.



Orin T. Howard, Santa Cruz, Calif., in place of F. T. Hale, retired.  
Adrian A. McMullen, Yuba City, Calif., in place of H. E. Meyers, retired.

## COLORADO

Frank H. Buskirk, Montrose, Colo., in place of T. W. Monell, deceased.

## CONNECTICUT

Fred E. Constantine, Lakeville, Conn., in place of J. J. O'Loughlin, resigned.

## GEORGIA

Howard Thompson, Alma, Ga., in place of J. G. Gruber. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

## IDAHO

Ferguson Hanmer, Salmon, Idaho, in place of F. A. McCall, resigned.

## INDIANA

Chester Wagoner, Flora, Ind., in place of Chester Wagoner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Donald Steinkamp, Holland, Ind., in place of Hugo Steinkamp, resigned.

## IOWA

Milo Mochal, Traer, Iowa, in place of E. M. Hyland, resigned.

## KANSAS

Alvin W. Gerber, Fowler, Kans., in place of M. H. Dyck, transferred.

Logan N. Green, Garden City, Kans., in place of R. E. Stotts, removed.

Florence T. Harbin, Irving, Kans., in place of C. R. Hollenberg, removed.

## LOUISIANA

Vada S. Clements, Ida, La., in place of M. R. James. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Alice M. Corey, Mattapoisett, Mass., in place of M. B. H. Ransom, resigned.

## MINNESOTA

Gertrude S. Dyson, Becker, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bert H. Myhre, Dexter, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Viola A. Raduenz, Lucan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dorothy C. Tice, Mentor, Minn., in place of Milla Tagley. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

## MISSISSIPPI

Hugh A. Kennedy, Louin, Miss., in place of L. G. Bassett, resigned.

## MISSOURI

Joseph H. Lowrie, Gallatin, Mo., in place of D. R. King. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1941.

## NEW YORK

Leonard J. McHugh, Depew, N. Y., in place of J. C. English, deceased.

Aaron Feldherr, Greenfield Park, N. Y., in place of Nettie Kass, removed.

Elroy R. Ganey, Jamestown, N. Y., in place of E. R. Ganey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles F. Schreier, Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of C. F. Schreier. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Edward P. Sullivan, Sunmount, N. Y., in place of A. S. Westlake, removed.

John T. Clark, Tuxedo Park, N. Y., in place of J. T. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary P. Carroll, Valley Falls, N. Y., in place of M. A. Sweeney, retired.

Theresa Jaeger, West Nyack, N. Y., in place of Marantha Knapp, resigned.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth O. Howard, Ocracoke, N. C. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

Robert O. Andrews, Tryon, N. C., in place of W. H. Stearns, retired.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Luella J. Hokanson, Fort Yates, N. Dak., in place of J. R. Turner, resigned.

Arne M. Sletten, Souris, N. Dak., in place of M. J. Dunbar, resigned.

## OHIO

John B. Mannino, Erieside, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## OKLAHOMA

J. C. Bennett, Jr., Tishomingo, Okla., in place of J. C. Bennett, resigned.

## OREGON

Gwendolyn H. Stemmerman, Powers, Oreg., in place of V. B. Lay, resigned.

Gerald E. Wright, Wauna, Oreg., in place of W. C. Sorsby, removed.

## PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Peterson, Berwick, Pa., in place of W. L. Shrader, removed.

Jerome E. Southerton, Honesdale, Pa., in place of C. H. Rettew, deceased.

William M. Rees, Linwood, Pa., in place of William Boyle, resigned.

## RHODE ISLAND

Walter B. Kingsley, Allenton, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Raymond L. Battey, Greenville, R. I., in place of R. L. Battey. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Wilkes, Chester, S. C., in place of J. H. Crawford, retired.

Inez C. Wilson, Williamston, S. C., in place of I. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## TENNESSEE

Elsie M. Johnson, Sewanee, Tenn., in place of Theron Myers, removed.

## TEXAS

Leander J. Scrivener, Eagle Pass, Tex., in place of M. B. Harper, resigned.

Arley T. McCarron, Ferris, Tex., in place of J. H. Moyers, transferred.

Jack P. Molloy, Uvalde, Tex., in place of J. W. White, retired.

## VERMONT

Herbert B. Butler, St. Albans, Vt., in place of H. B. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## VIRGINIA

Louise L. Smith, Greenway, Va., in place of L. M. Wing. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Maude V. Mills, Lynnhaven, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John E. Milan, Norfolk, Va., in place of R. W. Shultice, deceased.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Mary Allen, Filbert, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ethel Calloway, Mayberry, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## WISCONSIN

Frederick Walter Anderson, Hawkins, Wis., in place of J. P. Peterson, transferred.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

## WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

## APPOINTMENTS

James T. Black, of Texas, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office.

Lester G. Graham, of Texas, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the El Paso area office.

## SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Ellen S. Woodward to be member for the term expiring August 13, 1949.

## POSTMASTERS

## PENNSYLVANIA

Emma V. Snyder, Leesport.  
Cleona Fritz, Noxen.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, with grateful hearts we make known our praise and desires unto Thee at the altar of prayer. We most humbly thank Thee for our beloved country, built on the sacrifices and chivalry woven into the fabric of our national life. At the altar of consecration remind us of the toil and pain of our forefathers whose blood stained the calendar of history that the people might rule under a government of their own choice.

O Lord, God of hosts, hear the prayer of that Virginia patriot who stood in the front door of a new world:

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, love, mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, without a humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation. Grant our supplications, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 3, 1943, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings; and

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 997. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador; and

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566);  
S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 275. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 413. An act to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes;

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 636. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States;

S. 758. An act to repeal subsection (c) of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to authorize a uniform allowance for certain graduates of the United States Military Academy;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1076. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol;

S. 1101. An act to provide for payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

S. 1156. An act to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance of the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 85, 107, 142, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its

amendments numbered 15, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, and 174 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, agrees to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### RIGHT TO DECLARE RECESSES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of this week for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Reno Evening Gazette of June 21, 1943, on power generated at Boulder Dam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### MOSES TENNENBAUM

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the Private Calendar was called a certain bill was stricken from the calendar on the objection of three Members. I have since discussed the matter with these gentlemen and they offer no objection to my presenting a unanimous-consent request to restore that bill to the calendar.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Hon. Vincente Geigel-Polanco, senator at large of Puerto Rico, on the need for Puerto Rican independence.

This, Mr. Speaker, will take three and four-fifths pages and cost \$171.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to in-

clude therein a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WHO WANTS TO BE PRESIDENT?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SHORTAGE OF CORN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARENDS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein copy of a letter I addressed to Chairman LEA of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, together with an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the petroleum situation as it affects the whole Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

#### KEEP AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY FREE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I received in the mail this morning a letter from Mr. Rush Cole, president of the Southern States Industrial Council,



which, as everyone knows, is one of the most reactionary organizations in America, protesting against the Government taking over the coal mines.

This is one of the reactionary organizations that helped put through the Connally-Smith anti-labor, anti-industry bill, the organization, of course, thinking at the time that it only applied to labor. I predicted at the time that among the first to complain against the provisions of the bill would be the reactionary industrialists who were moving heaven and earth to put it through. Yes; these industrialists are now complaining because they find out that under the terms of the bill they will have to take the same medicine they thought they were prescribing for others. Yes, Mr. Industrialist, the dose you compounded for labor, not realizing that the Government doctor could put you on the same prescription, is pretty bitter, and I hope it will only take a few doses for you to realize that a mistake was made in passing this anti-industry, anti-labor legislation.

Let us keep American industry and labor free.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by Walter Lippmann on the subject of international agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIZLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by Owen L. Scott appearing in yesterday's Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

#### GOVERNMENT WASTE IN USE OF UNITED STATES MAIL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand 12 envelopes, each addressed to the same individual at the same factory in Massachusetts, each mailed on the same day and the same hour in Washington by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Each carries the identical four-page pamphlet, advising of the necessity of curtailing of published reports of the Department of Labor and calling attention to the Monthly Labor Review and various articles in it.

Why in the world should the Bureau of Labor Statistics be circularizing the American people?

Why should material sent out be distributed with such waste and carelessness?

No wonder the Post Office Department reported recently that it had been compelled in a single year to carry at the expense of the taxpayer no less than 3,000,000,000 pieces of penalty mail for the bureaucrats.

The sooner the Roosevelt bureaus realize that their work is primarily in the field of government and not in the field of publicity, leaving the latter to normal publicity channels, the sooner we will approach a government in terms of economy and efficiency that the people have a right to demand at this time when the country is fighting for its existence.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an interchange of correspondence with the War Department about the rotation of troops.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an address delivered at Juneau, Alaska, on June 18, by Col. K. B. Bush, chief of staff, Northwest Service Command.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.]

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by L. M. Jones, manager of the Washington Cannery Cooperative, Vancouver, Wash.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NORMAN]?

There was no objection.

#### CROP INSURANCE

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, last night at Columbia, S. C., National Commander Roane Waring, of the American Legion, delivered a Fourth of July address in which he charged the Federal Government with usurping States' rights and assuming control over individual citizens never intended by the authors of the Constitution.

The commander accused the Federal Government of creating a gigantic political octopus whose powerful tentacles seek to reach further into the private lives of American citizens, declaring:

Important as is the war effort, as necessary as it may be to devote our every energy to the successful conclusion of this war, we must be ever mindful that this war is being fought solely to vindicate, sustain, and perpetuate the America of our forefathers. It would be a tragedy to successfully conclude the war, dictate a peace of absolute victory, and then discover that we had lost our freedom and independence at home.

The veterans' leader praised Congress for awakening to its responsibilities, assailed bureaus and political marionettes, and then warned:

Here in this Government of ours, these so-called master minds of politics, distinguished only by their inexperience and incompetency, but steeped in foreign ideologies, have built a patchwork of bureaucratic directives. With these they seek to pit class against class, business against labor, farmer against consumer, and race against race.

The Federal Government has usurped the rights and obligations of the sovereign States to govern and protect their citizens, charged Commander Waring. Then, stressing that the advent of the war provided an opportunity for the employment at Washington of many more additional theorists and social reformers, he said:

These groups do not even agree among themselves as to just what type of government they want—the only thing that they can agree upon is that the ideals and doctrines handed down to us by our forefathers are outmoded and should be swept aside.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## PRICE CEILINGS ON CATTLE AND MEAT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend most highly our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WALTER C. FLOESER] on the six-point program he has outlined concerning the meat situation after conferring with all segments of the industry. This program involves ceilings on cattle and meat, on the retailers, the wholesalers, the slaughterers, the feeders, and the producers. He particularly draws attention to the protection that his plan involves for producers and feeders of cattle, including Government assistance where any deficiency exists in the apportionment of the over-all price range from producer to consumer. He provides for the establishment of feeder ceiling prices on all cattle except those graded AAA when dressed, and a ceiling on stocker and feeder cattle and beef calves. I doff my hat to the gentleman from Missouri, who has given us this statesmanlike program to relieve the meat situation.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and in one to include a radio address by Mr. J. F. Burke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose anybody is glad to have governmental controls over our economy, but I wonder if anybody thought when this war came and when these controls were provided for by Congress that they were going to be popular or that we were going to like them or that they would not inevitably lead to friction and sometimes mistakes and abuses of power that need correction. The fundamental thing to remember, however, is that you cannot fight a total war with everybody doing as they please. You cannot fight a total war unless you gear your Nation to do that job. Our

duty is not to complain about things but to attempt to improve them by constructive measures as we are able.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some resolutions adopted by the Department of Oregon Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

## THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be said that our synthetic-rubber program has moved along in remarkable fashion. There are two reasons for that. One is that control has been centralized. The other is that a very able, conscientious, experienced, and hard-working business executive has directed that program. I refer to Mr. William Jeffers, a Nebraskan of whom we are all proud.

I understand that the Committee on Agriculture has reported out the Fulmer bill which would put the food program under the control of one executive. I wonder why the majority leadership does not give us an opportunity to pass this bill. Before we got a Rubber Director this Congress passed a bill that was vetoed by the Executive. After much delay and the loss of precious time, the President proceeded to do what the bill provided for. If the passage of this Fulmer bill can serve some part in bringing about an end to the confusion and muddling in the field of food and food production, processing, and distribution, we ought to pass it. So long as the O. P. A. and other executive agencies undo what the Food Administrator is doing the situation becomes more confused and hopeless. Divided authority, cross purposes, ignorance, and lust for power here in Washington are producing empty market baskets.

## MEAT AND FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my re-

marks and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, you may get that beef a little quicker, it may be a little sweeter, there may be a little more of it, if you would just haul off some of your bureaucratic friends who are seizing the corn that should go into cattle. Last week one of those gentlemen sent out an order taking 25,000 bushels of corn from a citizen in an adjoining district. That corn he intended to make into feed for poultry and cows. You like eggs. We ship eggs to New York. Corn also goes in to feed beef. Now, you are not going to get the eggs, the poultry and the beef no matter what you and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER] cook up until you let the feeders have corn.

The new dealers have been plowing under, it is time to dig up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

## SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the separation of Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from the pay roll is an accomplished fact. Their execution date is now set for November instead of July, and I have no quarrel whatever to make with that decision except that it was, in the opinion of many of us, in favor of a method of doing so that is unconstitutional.

Today I am introducing a bill that I want you to study. I understand that it will be H. R. 3128. This bill will accomplish in a perfectly legal manner the separation from the pay roll not only of these men, but many others who may have been subversive in Government of the United States in their activities, or may have been associated with or members of subversive organizations. I want you to study this because it approaches the problem from a different angle, and makes it unlawful for any one of the subversives to accept employment. It also makes it unlawful for anyone having such authority in the Government to employ them, and it makes not only a felony



of the offense committed by the employer as well as the employee, but it makes this offense also a high crime and misdemeanor, and thus, for the first time, subject to the impeachment power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the disposition of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of food and feeding the Japs in the concentration camps.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia explain this legislation?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This is a bill that permits postal employees who are not included in the act of March 1942 to be permitted to work overtime in the Post Office Department on straight pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is to bring some of the employees up to the same level of pay as others?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. A unanimous report of the committee, and approved by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That so much as precedes the third proviso therein of section 1 of the act of August 14, 1935, entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. II, title 39, sec. 832), is amended to read as follows: "That when the needs of the service require supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, laborers, watchmen, and messengers, in first- and second-class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters of the

post-office inspectors, employees of the Stamped Envelope Agency and employees of the mail-equipment shops; cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, and elevator conductors, paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General; employees of the Air Mail Service; Cost Ascertainment employees (until such time as they shall be transferred to the departmental roll); employees upon the field roll of the Division of Equipment and Supplies and all employees of the Custodial Service except charwomen and charmen and those working part time, to perform service on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That employees who are granted compensatory time on Saturday for work performed the preceding Sunday or the preceding holiday shall be given the benefits of this act on 1 day within 5 working days following the Saturday when such compensatory time was granted: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time, such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed \$2,900 per annum, any emoluments received pursuant to the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," approved April 9, 1943, not to be considered as part of the earned basic compensation."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall remain in force only until June 30, 1945, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, and after such amendment ceases to be in force the provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "require", insert "postmasters of the first, second, and third classes."

On page 3, line 2, after the word "time", strike out the following: "such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed \$2,900 per annum."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO POSTMASTERS TO ENGAGE IN ESSENTIAL WAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 2922, a bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified Civil Service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purposes of the bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The purpose of the bill is to permit all postmasters to engage in essential war activities during the war emergency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is included under the term "essential war activities"?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This bill would give them the right, after they have completed their work, to return to the position which they occupied at the time they entered such essential work. The bill provides that they may return to their positions as postmasters by giving 40 days' notice after the termination of such essential activities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I presume the purpose is to permit them to go into essential war work, and after the war is over to return to their former positions?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the act approved December 6, 1940 (ch. 927, 54 Stat. 1221; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 39a), amending section 3 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1077), so as to authorize the Postmaster General to grant leave of absence without pay to postmasters entering the armed forces of the United States, shall likewise be applicable to postmasters relinquishing their positions to engage in pursuits which shall have been defined by the lawfully constituted authorities as essential activity: *Provided, however*, That a postmaster granted leave to engage in essential activity shall be permitted to resume his office as postmaster only if his application therefor is submitted within 40 days after the termination of such essential activity.

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on four subjects and include therein certain excerpts and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under its previous order, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Chair will cause the bells to be rung 10 minutes before the House is to reassemble.

Accordingly, at 12:35 p. m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock p. m.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1286. An act to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN,

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) entitled "An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2 and 11 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments Nos. 33 and 34, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2431) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

## AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, action on the agricultural appropriation bill has been completed in both the Senate and the House.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the amounts carried in the bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and finally as agreed to in both bodies, direct appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, and contract authorizations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1944

Items	Appropriations for 1943	Budget for 1944	Bill reported to House	Bill as passed House	Bill as passed Senate	Bill as finally enacted
From Federal funds:						
Carried in the bill:						
Direct appropriations.....	\$688,101,585	\$947,134,491	\$707,040,844	\$715,099,662	\$875,680,709	\$848,295,883
Reappropriations.....	69,573,935	28,449,655	4,691,210	4,691,210	4,691,210	4,691,210
Total direct appropriations and reappropriations.....	755,639,520	975,584,146	711,732,054	719,790,872	880,371,919	852,987,093
Corporate funds authorizations.....	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000
Loan authorizations (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds).....	140,000,000	157,500,000	90,000,000	-----	127,500,000	90,000,000
Contract authorizations.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Grand total, above items.....	907,961,520	1,145,406,146	814,054,054	732,112,872	1,020,193,919	955,309,093
Not carried in bill: Permanent appropriations.....	138,557,496	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663
Grand total, all items above.....	1,046,519,016	1,248,538,809	917,186,717	835,245,535	1,123,326,582	1,058,441,756
Trust funds (not carried in bill) <sup>2</sup> .....	179,495,310	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860

<sup>1</sup> Net total of Budget estimates from the time bill was pending in Senate, \$949,239,199.

<sup>2</sup> Commitments up to full parity for the 1942 crop authorized in the 1943 appropriation act and proposed in the Budget for authorization for the 1943 and 1944 crops. The bill as reported to the House, as passed by the House, and as finally enacted makes no provision for parity payments in connection with the 1943 or 1944 crops. The bill as it passed the Senate authorized full commitments for parity for the 1943 and 1944 crops.

<sup>3</sup> Funds held in trust by, but not belonging to, the United States.

## USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not because I appreciate that this is necessary in order to release some silver to manufacturing concerns engaged in war industries, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

I may say in explanation for the benefit of the Members of the House that in considering the bill we were rather hard-pressed for time. This question of silver now before us affects very vitally not only the war industry at this time, but it affects very deeply and vitally the fundamental economy of a cluster of States in this Union. This product, silver, herein involved, might properly be referred to as the keystone in their economic struc-

ture. The committee was disposed, Mr. Speaker, to take sufficient time to analyze this entire problem, to go into it very exhaustively, but we were mindful of the fact that it could not be done at the present time. It was the disposition of the committee to try and limit the number of ounces and the time during which the bill should be effective, but we realized that we could not do so in the few short days remaining prior to the recess. The subcommittee had intended to offer an amendment to the so-called Green bill, but we thought that perhaps we might run into some difficulties with the Senate; so, in the interest of speed and in fulfillment, I may say, of an understanding or an agreement between the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, and I presume with the Speaker but to which neither I as chairman of the subcommittee nor my distinguished chairman of the full committee were parties, we felt obligated to proceed with due dispatch in order to get it out of the way. This entire silver question might, of course, be reviewable sometime during the next year, but it is not very likely. Had the amendment of advancing the expiration prevailed, and had we undertaken to fight it out with the Sen-

ate and further delay this matter, this question of silver, so vital to the Nation, might later have been reviewed, but now I do not think it will be; I think it is a settled matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand several factories will have to close down within the next few days unless this bill passes without amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. The War Production Board informed the committee, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of silver available for critical wartime use and other domestic purposes would not last beyond the balance of this month, so it is pressing from that standpoint that we act and not get into difficulties in a conference with the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is there anything in this legislation which amends or changes existing Silver Purchase Acts or silver legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. Not to my knowledge. This, as I understand it, is acceptable in every respect to the silver bloc in the



Senate and likewise acceptable to those Senators from the eastern seaboard where silver is used in the manufacturing business.

Mr. WHITE. What is the price?

Mr. DINGELL. The price will be in accordance with the Silver Purchase Act, 71.11 cents.

Mr. WHITE. It is to be sold at that figure?

Mr. DINGELL. That is the way I understand it. That is provided specifically in the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is the bill that was referred to by the minority leader of the House at the time what was called the Celler amendment was voted on. We who were opposed to the Celler amendment decided not to oppose it upon the ground that later on the Congress would pass the bill that the gentleman has now presented to the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I may say that on this side we have had several bills, one offered by the persistent gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], for which he has pressed continuously throughout this entire session and for which he pressed even in the preceding session. We have had certain other bills introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Reed] a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, also by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Compton], and there are other bills that have a direct bearing on the subject of silver which could not, of course, be considered at this time. It must be said in deference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] that he has been pressing for hearings in connection with this bill for many months, to my knowledge.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is my understanding this bill will be read and will be subject to amendment, providing there is no objection to its consideration under the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, it would be subject to amendment, but the Chair is going to be very frank with the gentleman. If there are going to be amendments offered to this bill the Chair will request the gentleman from Michigan to withdraw his request, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Chair thinks it vitally important that this bill pass immediately, and he thinks it should be passed without amendment. The Chair will accept the responsibility if it is put up to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In order to get this matter straightened out, and I do not want to impede the passage of this bill, would it be in order to read the bill and then offer a pro forma amendment and secure time for making a few remarks in that manner?

The SPEAKER. If the bill is before the House for consideration, amendments may be offered, of course. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio if he would like some time he may reserve the right to object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have already reserved the right to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Smith]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intended to offer an amendment striking out 71.11 cents, the price fixed in S. 35 at which the Treasury shall sell the silver it holds, and substitute in lieu thereof a price not to exceed 50 cents per fine troy ounce.

I see this has now been made impossible. The Congress stands with a gun to its head and is ordered to pass immediately this bill with practically no debate or consideration.

To treat so important a bill as the one before us in this manner is to me an act of shame.

The price of 71 cents provided in the bill would curtail appreciably the uses of silver for the production of war materials. The price of 50 cents would in comparison increase materially its uses for this purpose.

The Treasury Department has stated this to be a fact and has recommended the price be set at 50 cents and not 71 cents.

It has stated further that no profit would accrue to the Treasury if the silver were sold to war industries at 71 cents an ounce instead of 50 cents, because the price at which it sold silver would come back as a war cost to the Government anyway.

Speaking for the Treasury Department in a letter, dated March 12, 1943, to Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. D. W. Bell, Acting Secretary, said:

This Department has approved a minimum average price of 50 cents per fine troy ounce as provided in S. 35. This approval was based on the belief that silver now held in the general fund of the Treasury should be made available for war uses without loss to the Treasury, but at a price which will permit the users to continue producing war materials with little or no increase in the cost of producing them. It is the view of this Department that the establishment of a minimum price above an average of 50 cents per fine troy ounce will not result in any benefit to the Government, since the war materials produced with it will cost more, and that cost will ultimately be charged to the Government. It is suggested, therefore, that S. 192 be amended to provide a minimum average price of 50 cents per fine troy ounce. (Hearing before the Bank-

ing and Currency Committee of the Senate, 78th Cong., Apr. 28 and 29, 1943, p. 22.)

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, April 6, 1943, stated:

It is felt that the minimum price of 71.11 cents per ounce will be detrimental to the expansion of the substitution of silver in place of other scarce metals for war uses (ibid., p. 24).

Again on April 26, 1943, in a second letter to Senator WAGNER, Mr. Nelson reiterated what he had previously stated on this point and went further by, in effect, recommending the price be fixed at 50 cents per ounce. He said:

I would much prefer to have silver released at the lowest price possible, as this will mean that it will be available to a larger group of manufacturers. Therefore, I believe that the high price will restrict the substitution of silver in war equipment (ibid., p. 24).

Capt. R. S. McDowell, Deputy Director, Resources Division, Office of Procurement and Materials, Navy Department, testified for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency April 29, 1943, in precisely the same vein when he said:

However, as to the use of silver for war production purposes, I would have the personal opinion that the lower price would permit a freer flow of the material (ibid., p. 35).

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, in a letter to Senator WAGNER, March 16, 1943, expressed his opinion to S. 192 which contained a provision for a minimum price of 71.11 cents per ounce for silver sold for war uses. He said:

It is the opinion of the Navy Department that the numerous provisions of the bill S. 192 would hedge the sale or lease of silver with so many restrictions as to nullify completely the usefulness of the statute. The Navy Department, in view of the above, recommends that the bill S. 192 be reported out unfavorably, and that the bill do not be enacted (ibid., pp. 22 and 23).

Here then is the Treasury recommending that the sale price of Treasury-owned silver for war uses be fixed at 50 cents and not at 71 cents and that the Treasury will not suffer any loss if this is done.

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, the man who is charged with the responsibility of knowing what is best in this case, what is in the greatest interest of the war effort, says to this Congress, Do not make the price of silver 71 cents an ounce, because if you do you will hurt the war effort by withholding war supplies from our boys on the battle front that they ought to have. Make it 50 cents an ounce, he admonishes us, then you will be helping the war effort by providing our brave soldiers with all the available weapons they need to defend their lives and the life of our country.

Captain McDowell, who also holds a highly responsible position in the prosecution of this war, tells us the same thing.

Who wants the price of 71 cents? Why, the domestic silver mining interests and nobody else. Apparently they are more interested in assuring the continuation of their subsidy program than they are in winning the war.

True enough, these selfish interests might not be hurt so much just now if

the price of silver sold to war industries by the Treasury were reduced to 50 cents, because they have an outlet for this silver at a much higher price than this. It is the future they look to. They want to hold on to their subsidy program so that when the war is over they can start right in milking the American people again.

What a silly thing this is we are asked to do here. The people in general have already bought and paid for in full the silver which the Treasury has acquired. This has cost them 50 cents an ounce. Why should they now go through the asinine performance of selling this same silver to war industries at a premium of 21 cents and then turn right around and pay back to those same war industries that premium of 21 cents?

Furthermore, this senseless procedure would be bound to create some inflation. How much we cannot tell, but it could be considerable.

The history of this proposed piece of legislation is a disgrace to the Nation, and, like so many other devious courses pursued in the last few years by selfish groups to secure through legislation means to milk the public, augurs all too ill for the Nation.

But it does not appear to me that the silver mining interests are alone responsible for the delay and cunning that has been practiced in railroading this measure through, as is being done.

Rear Admiral T. J. Kelerher, Office of Procurement Materials, Navy Department, testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency—S. 2768—last October that at that time enough silver for war purposes was available but indicated by the first of 1943 military needs for silver would become pressing.

Senator GREEN, at the hearings on S. 35, S. 192, and S. 1036, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on the 28th of April, this year, more than 2 months ago, stated:

I am told by reliable authority that the existing stocks are such and that the expected increase of silver available as a result of domestic production or foreign production and import is such that perhaps the stocks will be exhausted in 10 days.

Donald M. Nelson wrote a letter to Mr. WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last March 11, nearly 4 months ago, in which he said:

The supplies of foreign silver available for war production are being consumed rapidly. Many critical metals can be conserved by the substitution of silver if an assured supply of silver for consumptive uses can be made available. It would be assured by the passage of this bill, which I therefore recommend (ibid, p. 8).

Notwithstanding these claims made months ago by responsible persons that there was then urgent need for the passage of an act giving the Treasury authority to sell of its silver stock, silver for consumptive war uses, nothing was done about it until the present moment when Congress is about to recess.

This procedure has been deliberately framed up so as to slip the bill through

with the special provision giving the silver interests the means to continue their pernicious racket.

We are told at this late hour that the war supplies of silver will be exhausted within a week or 10 days, that there must be no delay in examining the bill or amending it, that we must swallow it whole, that if we don't do this we are hindering the war effort.

This is a contemptible procedure. If the shortage of silver for war uses is as critical as is claimed then there has been unforgivable negligence on the part of every person responsible for supplying the silver needs of war industries, to say nothing of the sordid tactics that are being pursued in the manipulation of this bill.

If the testimony offered on this bill by Mr. Bell in behalf of the Treasury, of Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and Captain McDowell of the Navy Department represents true facts, and there is no evidence to the contrary, then we cannot escape the conclusion that the silver interests, by their finagling this measure through the Congress have deliberately hampered and impeded the war effort.

Nor can the Congress escape its responsibility for any damage this act may do to our war effort.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I may say that those who will purchase this silver are perfectly ready and willing to pay 71 cents and a fraction for the silver during the war because they do not care to upset any conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that passed the Senate unanimously. It is a war measure and is urgently needed. I fully agree with those who would like to see silver sold at less than 71.11 cents because much of it was bought by the Treasury at 47 cents, but it is this bill or no bill and if we do not pass this bill as it is drawn we shall not have this legislation. The money that is paid goes into the Treasury at 71.11.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the benefit of the House that the committee in the short time at its disposal delved into the question of the 71.11 cents provided in the bill. The committee considered changing the date in order to give us some leverage for reconsideration of the entire question. More than that, the committee considered the possibility of limiting the amount of silver to be released under this bill. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is cognizant of all facts because he was granted the courtesy by the committee of sitting in our executive session, so he is fully familiar with what went on. There is no disposition on our part to rush anything through. It is an absolute essential under the circumstances to put this bill through without quibbling and to put it through immediately as a war measure.

Now I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I have striven long and ardently for some action on silver. At last we are getting some action. It is not the action which is thoroughly and eminently satisfactory, but, at least, there is some action. It is half-a loaf. We must be practical. It is the best we can get under the circumstances now obtaining.

This so-called Green bill should be accepted. It provides for the sale or lease of free silver at 71.11 cents per ounce. The Treasury in most instances paid far less than this amount. The silver purchase acts require the Treasury to pay that amount for domestically mined silver, but most of the silver now stored at West Point was dug out from foreign mines. That foreign silver cost the Treasury on the average of 45 cents per ounce. The amount of silver purchased from foreigners, as of March 1943 was 2,158,000,000 ounces. The amount purchased from Americans as newly mined silver was 501,000,000. Thus, it is discernible that foreigners have gained most from these silver purchase acts. Most of the silver we have at West Point has been purchased from foreigners. Thus, through Silver Purchase legislation, we are creating an artificial price, not only for domestic silver but for foreign silver, the domestic price being 71.11 per ounce and the foreign price that of 45 cents an ounce.

The Treasury under the Green bill, which we will pass this afternoon, must sell the silver to war industries for 71.11 cents per ounce. Thus on the foreign silver, the Government will make an average profit of 26.11 cents. That silver will go into war productions and the public will pay that difference. It is like taking out of one pocket and putting into another. It is, however, inflationary, to the extent of 26.11 cents per ounce. Of course, the silver bloc in the other Chamber would not let the bill go out unless it contained the ceiling price of 71.11 cents. That bloc still wants to maintain the artificial price for silver—prices far beyond the intrinsic value.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are going to pay 71 cents an ounce for this silver, I understand. Is that right?

Mr. CELLER. I am opposed to the paying of 71 cents. In common parlance—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute; are you going to do it?

Mr. CELLER. In common parlance, we have been a bunch of suckers to the foreign silver producers. We have been paying them 45 cents on an average for silver not worth anywhere near that sum.



Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. Let the gentleman speak for himself when he begins to call people suckers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, then?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How did he get the floor?

The SPEAKER. He got it in a perfectly proper way.

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When are you going to raise the price of corn so our feeders can get some corn and you can get some meat, that you have been squawking about for the last few weeks.

Mr. CELLER. You answer that yourself. I cannot answer it now. Corn has no relation to silver.

We have two kinds of silver, free silver and monetary silver. I have not the figures before me, but roughly, one-half of the 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver that we have is free silver, that is, not used to back up currency. The other half, roughly, is called monetary silver and is used to ground or back up silver certificates in circulation. At the present time, none of the silver can be used for consumptive purposes in war industries. We do use free silver for non-consumptive purposes. That is a sort of lend-lease affair. The Treasury Department lend-leases the silver in the form of bus bars to hydroelectric and power companies and other public utility corporations for conductivity of electricity, but these bus bars must be returned after the war to the Treasury in the same form, shape and size as they were originally loaned to the public utility corporations. The bus bar is a non-consumptive use.

This Green bill will now substitute monetary silver for the free silver in the form of bus bars. It will also release the free silver for consumptive purposes and silver will thus be made use of as substitutes for strategic war materials, like tin, copper, chrome, and so forth. It can thus be melted down and be used as an alloy. Such consumptive uses would be impossible without the authority under this bill.

The silver can only be sold or leased by the Treasury when authorized by the President and upon recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board. All operations under the bill expire December 31, 1944.

However, I shall not rest secure, nor stop my campaign unless and until all the silver purchase acts are wiped clean off the statute books. To keep paying 71.1 cents per ounce for all domestically mined silver is just silly. Under these acts we must keep purchasing this silver forever and a day—at least until the amount of silver that the Treasury has equals one-third of all monetary metal. It will be well-nigh impossible for the silver to be purchased to the

extent of one-third of a total of the supply of gold and silver. Be advised we have \$23,000,000,000 worth of gold stored at Fort Knox as against a little over \$2,000,000,000 worth of silver stored at West Point. The ratio must reach 2 to 1, \$2 worth of gold to \$1 worth of silver. Considering the fact that we have \$23,000,000,000 worth of gold, it would take a century to reach that ratio of 2 to 1.

Thus the silver bloc is sitting pretty, unless we rip out the foundations from under it.

Furthermore, to point out the absurdity of the silver situation, there are over 460,000,000 standard silver dollars in circulation. We usually call these cart wheels. Only 63,000,000 of these are in circulation. People just do not want to use them. The balance of the 460,000,000 of these cart wheels are stored away, unused.

Despite all these objections, I still want this bill to pass because at last we will be putting silver in uniform.

It is hoped that the silver subcommittee appointed by Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee will continue after the recess so that my bill to repeal the silver purchase acts may be adequately considered and favorably acted upon.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of this measure and shall vote for it. There is much I would like to say on this subject but as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] says "This is a war measure." I will therefore not delay proceedings very long at this time. However, I cannot let the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] and some of the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] go entirely unchallenged.

The gentleman from Ohio is the bitterest foe of silver whom I know of in this membership. He wants all modern silver legislation repealed. He would demote one of the precious metals, one used since the dawn of civilization as money and recognized by the founders of this Republic, to the status of a mere commodity and stricken entirely from its proud place in our monetary system. At least, that is the way I judge his implied attitude toward the white metal. Be that as it may, he does want our Government-owned silver sold to private industry from the United States Treasury for 50 cents an ounce. Nor do I understand that the gentleman would have such Government silver sold to private parties exclusively for war uses. He would tell you that this silver was purchased, at least some of it, by the Treasury for about 71 cents an ounce.

Granting that assumption for sake of argument, is it a crime then for the United States Government to sell to private parties a thing which it paid for at the rate of 71 cents an ounce for the sale price of 71 cents an ounce? Of course, it is said that this is to go into the war effort. Is it so asinine as the

gentleman has declared for the Government to receive at the rate of 71 cents an ounce for its silver going into the war effort when the Government pays 71 cents an ounce? I greatly fear the gentleman's argument will not stand the test of logic in more than one respect. It is one thing for him to say that the Government ought not to pay 71 cents an ounce for silver; it is an entirely different thing for him to advocate selling that same silver to private purchasers for 50 cents an ounce. Nor does it clear the situation to say that 50 cents is the average price paid.

In his ardent desire to wipe out all existing legislation dealing with silver, he is playing in the hands of a class in this country who have usurped the constitutional and sovereign power of issuing money which power and right should belong to the Government only. The gentleman apparently would take from the Treasury now all silver, even that which is held against silver certificates, and thus force the retirement of silver certificates from our monetary system. This, of course, would mean either harmful deflation or the substitution of another kind of paper money in lieu of those silver certificates. This other kind of paper money would, under our present laws, necessarily be a currency founded on an interest-bearing indebtedness. This interest burden would be an additional load upon the back of the taxpayers for the privilege of having private parties furnish us the money which is needed today instead of the constitutional money of the fathers.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has all along contended that silver should be "put into the war effort," with which I agree and have agreed all along, and he implies that the failure to enact his amendment to the Treasury Appropriation Bill is depriving the war effort of the necessary silver. I deny that. I feel that the crippling amendment which the gentleman from New York offered to the Treasury appropriation bill on February 5, would not so much aid the war effort as provide cheap silver for the manufacture of articles for nonessential domestic uses.

A false impression has gotten abroad, especially last year, that a great horde of silver was lying useless and denied to the war effort. I knew positively more than a year ago, that the Secretary of the Treasury and high officials of this Government had all the power necessary to use for war purposes in bus bars and other nonconsumptive ways, such silver in the Treasury as was not needed as backing for our silver certificates. I know further that provision was made months ago for a sufficient amount of silver for consumptive use in the war effort much more than the war requirements called for. In talking, last session, with my colleagues, who are interested in silver, I know that there was a disposition on their part to write into law a year ago, the provisions of the bill now before us. To my knowledge no body in the membership of Congress has had any disposition to deny silver held by the Government out of the war uses. In

fact, we want silver to be used in the war effort, both consumptively and non-consumptively to the fullest extent necessary for the winning of the war.

What we are objecting to is any attempt to furnish silver at 50 cents an ounce for private uses which are not essential to the war effort. I think it unnecessary and unwise to sell silver for the war effort at less than 71 cents an ounce. I certainly do oppose any effort to strike silver from its rightful place in our monetary system which the fathers of the Republic assigned to it. Mr. Speaker, this bill might have been passed a year ago with my consent. In my judgment it will enable silver to play the part it should play in our war effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell, or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, for purposes, including but not limited to the making of munitions of war and the supplying of civilian needs, and the converting of existing plants to those purposes, any silver held or owned by the United States: Provided, That no silver shall be sold under this act at less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: Provided further, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.*

Sec. 2. This act shall expire on December 31, 1944.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

#### WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a perfecting amendment to the Wheeler-Case Act, which has passed this House and has been in operation. A good many projects started up, but due to the lack of authority in the present war, they cannot go forward. This simply provides the authority for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, it simply provided that these projects would be built by C. C. C. and

P. W. A. labor, which now is out of the question, and this provides a new means.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I may add that this bill, or an identical bill, was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at the time it was reported out. The minority leader will find on questioning any member of that committee, on his side of the aisle, that we felt this a necessary war measure in our food production program. Not only did the Secretary of the Interior recommend that it be passed, but the War Food Administration is strongly back of it. It will enable the Wheeler-Case Act to be transformed into a war act and enable numerous small projects in the semi-arid West to add to the total food-producing areas in the shortest possible time. I trust that the measure may be handled with dispatch. H. R. 3019 is identical with S. 1252. Therefore, I hope in the interest of speed that the Senate bill will be passed in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), is hereby amended to read as follows: "And provided further, That expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation as defined in section 4 (b) shall not exceed \$2,000,000 for dams and reservoirs in any one project, and that expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet costs allocated to flood control by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department, shall not exceed \$500,000 on any one project."*

Sec. 2. Subparagraph (vii) of subsection 3 (a) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(vii) The part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to flood control as recommended by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department."

Sec. 3. Subsection 3 (b) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) No actual construction of the physical features of a project shall be undertaken unless and until (1) the Secretary has found that lands, or interests in lands, deemed necessary for the construction and operation of the major features of the projects have been secured, or sufficient progress made in their procurement to indicate the probability that all these lands or interests in lands can be secured, with titles and at prices satisfactory to him; and (2) the Secretary has found (i) that water rights adequate for the purposes of the project have been acquired with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, or that such water rights have been initiated and in his judgment can be perfected in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him; and (ii) that such water rights can be utilized for the purposes of the project in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him."

Sec. 4. Section 3 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Any part of a project hereunder may be designated as a division of the project by the Secretary if he, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, deems this desirable for orderly and efficient construction or administration. The term 'project', as used in subsection 3 (b) and section 4, shall be deemed to mean also 'division of a project', designated as provided in this subsection. Any project authorized for construction from appropriations under the head 'Water Conservation and Utility Projects' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685), hereinafter called the 1940 water conservation appropriation, may be designated by the Secretary, upon agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, a project under this act and shall thereupon be subject to all the provisions and requirements thereof, except those of subsections 3 (a) and (3) (b)."

Sec. 5. Section 4 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(d) For each project on which construction is commenced or continued under this subsection appropriations heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to section 12 and the unexpended balance of the 1940 water conservation appropriation, in addition to being available for other authorized objects of expenditure, shall be available for expenditure, by the agency to which available, in lieu of the 'services, labor, materials, or other property, including money', authorized to be utilized under section 2 and subsection 5 (b). All expenditures on each such project may be excluded (1) from the project construction costs to the extent the Secretary finds necessary to keep the reimbursable costs within the findings made under subsections 3 (a) (iv), 3 (a) (v), and 3 (a) (vi), and (2) from the costs that but for this subsection would be required to be returned under section 5, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture for the successful prosecution of the project; and as to each such project the limitations on expenditures provided in sections 1 and 9 shall be inoperative. Appropriations made pursuant to section 12 shall be available for expenditures for continuation of construction on any project heretofore undertaken under the 1940 water conservation appropriation, and such expenditures and those from the 1940 water conservation appropriation may be excluded from the costs of any such project in determining the amounts required to be reimbursed, to the extent the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture jointly determine is necessary to keep reimbursable costs within the ability of the water users to repay. No project may be initiated for construction or, if heretofore authorized, continued under this subsection unless the Secretary, following consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, finds that the proposed construction under this subsection is justifiable as an aid in the production of needed agricultural products and the President approves said finding. The utilization of services or labor of prisoners of war under section 2 is authorized, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of said prisoners. From and after the date 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, this subsection shall no longer be of any force or effect except as to projects on which construction has been initiated or continued under this subsection prior to said date."

Sec. 6. Section 5 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300, the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41



U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase or service authorized for the Department of Agriculture under this act or under the 1940 water conservation appropriation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

#### MEDICAL DEPARTMENT, REGULAR ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 14, page 3, and insert: "That there is hereby established in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the 'Pharmacy Corps.' The Pharmacy Corps shall consist of seventy-two officers in grades from colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive. Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps, except as hereinafter provided for transfer thereto, shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-two years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring four years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after three years' service, to the grade of captain after six years' service, to the grade of major after twelve years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after twenty years' service, and to the grade of colonel after twenty-six years' service: *Provided*, That officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the Medical Administrative Corps on the date of enactment of this Act shall be transferred to the Pharmacy Corps and commissioned in grade in such corps in addition to the seventy-two officers authorized for the corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain these amendments? As I understand it this bill provides for the addition of some 42.

Mr. MAY. That is the only change that the Senate has made.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he can inform the House when they expect to bring in a bill increasing the allowances for dependents of veterans in this war, particularly the fathers and mothers and children.

Mr. MAY. That bill does not relate in any sense to the pending bill. As a matter of fact, we have not yet taken it up, and it has not been called to our

attention. It was introduced in the Senate only last week.

Mr. FISH. Did it not go through the Senate today?

Mr. MAY. If it did, I have had no notice of it, and I have not had time to get my committee together yet.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman will get his committee together before midnight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the pharmacy corps."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may extend his remarks and include an address made at his request by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], July 4, 1943, together with historical notes and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered to the Massachusetts Members of Congress by the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. RENZIE GRAHAM

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on the last call of the Private Calendar, the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham was stricken from the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it may be restored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Chaney on Starving Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include, first, an article by Channing Pollock, and, secondly, an article by John H. Cline, both of which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an address I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I made on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an address by Hon. Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PLOESER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a very fine report on the Women's Army Corps, just created, by Father Casey, of the Women's Army Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter to the President, one to Mr. Ickes, and a document. I have an estimate from the Public Printer. It is estimated it will require three and one-fifth pages and will cost \$144. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a piece of poetry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of June 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances: First, in connection with the Governor of Louisiana, and, in the other, in connection with the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2968), making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, further insist upon the House disagreement to amendments Nos. 33 and 34, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

#### J. FRANK MEADOR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1334), an act for the relief of J. Frank Meador, with Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows.

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "appropriated," down to and including "1942" in line 10 and insert "to J. Frank Meador, of Atlanta, Ga., (1) the sum of \$500 in a lump sum as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act and (2) the sum of

\$100 per month for each month beginning with the month in which this act is enacted and ending with the twentieth month for which such payments of \$100 are made or the month preceding the month of death of the said J. Frank Meador, whichever may be the earlier; the payment of such sums to be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said J. Frank Meador as the result of having been struck by a bicycle operated by a special-delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on June 30, 1942."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GEN. WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to report to the House the untimely, unfortunate, and tragic death of a great soldier, statesman, and patriot, a man of great ability and renown, who was recognized as a brilliant military leader, as a strategist and tactician. I refer to the esteemed and noble Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and commander in chief of the valiant Polish Army. His sudden death in the crash of a British aerial transport cuts short a brilliant and most promising career which held so much substance for the emancipation and future of his beloved country and for the saddened people of Poland. His passing creates a great and unprovided emergency affecting deeply and vitally the councils of the United Nations. The void thus created must and will be filled by a worthy and able successor, worthy of the trust and of the confidence of his own people and of an anxious and bereaved world. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can say that would add one iota of credit or luster to the name, fame, or accomplishment of this great man. It is not my purpose therefore to eulogize General Sikorski whom I was privileged to know, to break bread with, and to discuss subjects of importance. It is my intent to place my humble, verbal wreath in tribute to his memory and to offer a silent yet fervent prayer that God shall grant unto him and all those who perished with him that eternal and heavenly peace which the world cannot give.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join my colleagues in expressing the sorrow of the very many people caused by the passing of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government-in-exile and commander of its armed forces. He died last night when a Liberator plane in which he was traveling crashed shortly after taking off from Gibraltar. The plane crashed into the sea shortly after its take-off; all of the passengers and the crew, except the pilot, were killed. It is

pathetic that among the passengers and victims was General Sikorski's daughter, Mrs. Sophia Lesniowska, 26, who was traveling with her father as liaison officer between the London headquarters of the Polish Auxiliary Territorial Service—women's forces—and the Middle East. She was wearing an A. T. S. uniform. Her husband is a prisoner of war in Germany.

General Sikorski had been visiting Polish armed forces in the Middle East and was in Cairo as recently as last Friday.

His death came at a moment when the forces which he had been organizing to fight for the liberation of Poland were at last ready to take part in the offensive they had been planning since September 1939, when their country fell before the German invaders.

General Sikorski, the leader of the Polish Nation-in-exile, was a man worthy of those whom he led, under the White Eagle of Poland. He was the Polish Premier and the commander in chief of all of the Polish armed forces and was a man who has proved his worth in times of hardship and was by destiny the one to whom all the Poles looked forward to to lead his government to the greatness in the times of peace. His voice was that traditional of the freedom-loving Poles and cried aloud at all times: "We fight for our liberty and yours." He had known the hardship of battle and was familiar with the vicissitudes inflicted upon his nation by the German invader under the leadership of the hangman Hitler.

He was born May 20, 1881, in southern Poland, the son of a gentleman farmer. His father died when he was but a child of 3, and at the age of 15 years he started to pay his own education in Krakow and later at Lwow Technical University College. He was a brilliant student of civil engineering and a general of the military arts of the first magnitude.

His whole life was devoted to the cause of Polish independence. He was on a mission to the ancient city of Baghdad where he had inspected the troops of Poland, where he declared they were ready and fit to fight in accordance with their training and ideals. Just 3 hours before the plane on which he died crashed into the sea, he went on the eve of the one hundred and sixty-seventh Independence of the American Colonies a message to the President of the United States in which he expressed the warmest felicitations and friendship of the subjugated but yet unconquered Polish Nation to the people of America, and he expressed his firm conviction that the United States of America will ever be ready to stand by and defend the cause of conquered nations as expressed in the United Nations' pact.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in paying a tribute and honoring the memory of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski who was killed yesterday in an airplane accident along with his staff near Gibraltar. He was commander in chief of the Polish Army and likewise Prime Minister of the exiled Polish Government, at London, England.



General Sikorski appeared twice before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives within the last year at executive sessions and presented to the committee fuller and more detailed information about the eastern European situation than anyone had done since the war began. He was an outstanding statesman and officer or he would not have been both the Prime Minister and the commander in chief of the Polish Government-in-exile. His appearance and comments before the Committee on Foreign Affairs made a great impression upon me. He was a sincere friend of our institutions and of America.

As we know in America this war broke out in Europe back on September 1, 1939, because Great Britain and France guaranteed to uphold the territorial integrity of Poland. That is what General Sikorski likewise was endeavoring to uphold as well as to restore the independence of Poland as a free and sovereign nation.

In view of the fact that the preservation of the territorial integrity of Poland was the origin of the European war, the restoration of Poland's independence and its territorial integrity should be one of its main objectives. I hope that when this war has been won by an all-out victory that there will again be a free and independent Poland based upon its pre-war territorial boundaries for which General Sikorski and the Polish people have fought, sacrificed, and died. I am opposed to a fifth partition of Poland and believe the American people will insist on the restoration of a free and independent Poland with its pre-war boundaries intact. If this is not done then General Sikorski and hundreds of thousands of patriotic Poles will have died in vain and millions of Poles will have endured the misery, suffering, human slavery, and starvation of a conquered nation likewise in vain. The memory of General Sikorski, a gallant soldier and an able statesman, lives on and will inspire and encourage the Polish people to continue the battle to restore a free and independent Poland.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have just learned the sad news of the death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, that great Polish soldier and statesman. The great white Polish eagle, the Polish symbol of freedom, liberty, and democracy, with a heart already overflowing with grief and sorrow, today is further grief stricken with the announcement of the loss of this great patriot and leader who had worked so hard and labored day and night to rebuild the Polish forces in our mutual struggle to defeat the brutal Nazis.

I had the privilege of meeting this splendid soldier on his last visit to the United States, and spent an hour listening to his interesting observations and suggestions for the future peace of the world. He loved and admired our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He highly praised the American citizens for our high ideals and principles, for our inherent burning desire to preserve de-

mocracy, freedom, and liberty, for our devotion to the principles of the "four freedoms," and prayed that God would grant our great President and Commander in Chief health and strength to carry through in this world struggle.

He had implicit faith, trust, and confidence in the President and the people of the United States. On behalf of himself and the Polish Nation he fervently expressed the indebtedness and deep gratitude that the poor unfortunate people of Poland felt toward the people of the United States.

And, likewise, it may be said, that President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill reposed implicit faith and confidence in the great Polish general and Prime Minister of Poland. He was one of the great moving spirits in the Allied cause. He at all times possessed that deep, firm, and unwavering conviction that victory for the Allied cause was certain, that Nazi brutality was doomed to failure, and that the future of Poland was that of a noble and glorious nation. He possessed that spark and fighting leadership that knows no defeat. It was around this confident and fighting spirit that the refugees and remnants of the Polish Army gathered and reorganized themselves into a firm and valiant fighting force—the greatest of any of the conquered nations. As if by a miracle, these new Polish fighting forces were organized—12,000 in the Polish Air Corps in England, 30,000 in the Motorized Army Corps in England, 250,000 in the Near East, fully equipped, and in the recent words of the general "spoiling for action." Besides all of this, a reborn Polish Navy that has won the respect of the British naval men for its fearless fighting qualities and its many victorious naval engagements.

Yes; the rebirth of the Polish armed forces was astounding and unbelievable. Although defeated and vanquished by the overwhelming mechanical and numerical superiority of the Nazi hordes in September of 1939, the Poles did not lay down their arms, they did not lose their morale; all who avoided capture by the Nazis or escaped from prison camps arrived in France by way of Hungary and Rumania and entered the army then being rebuilt by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski. After the collapse of France these Polish forces transferred to Scotland and England to continue their feverish work of reorganization. It was from the now famous Polish Eagle Squadron, organized on British soil, that Berlin received its first bombing.

We also read accounts of this valiant air force defending London against enemy attacks and later found that they were the spearhead of the Allied aerial attacks against the Nazi Luftwaffe. Time after time these fighting men of Poland were commended by English officers for their heroic deeds, for their valiant and unconquerable spirit. Ignoring overwhelming odds, refusing to submit to the yoke of tyranny, these Polish forces of freedom and liberty, led by the spirit exhibited by that indomitable leader, General Sikorski, distinguished themselves at

Norway, Narvik, Tobruk, in the African campaigns, on the seas, and in the air.

On the Fourth of July, the last message that the general sent shortly before he was killed, was received by President Roosevelt. He said:

I wish today, on the Fourth of July, to pay my sincere homage to the great American Nation, especially as I am spending it as a guest of the Governor of Gibraltar, where I have met some of your officers. I am convinced that under you, Mr. President, the inspired leader of the American Nation, and in close collaboration with Great Britain, the victory will soon come to the United Nations. This victory will not only crush the enemy, but also bring into being your principles of freedom and justice.

General Sikorski had been visiting the Polish armed forces in the Near East, and was just returning to London. His death came at a moment when the forces which he had been organizing to fight for the liberation of Poland were at last ready to strike, and perhaps play an important part in the coming offensive in Europe. The Polish Army in the Near East is ready. It is reverberating with the spirit of General Sikorski. Yes, "spoiling for action," is the way he described his brave legions. Though General Sikorski is gone, his spirit will lead on. The fighting spirit of Sikorski is imbued in every Pole, no matter where he be, in England, Scotland, Africa, the Near East, Russia, or in Poland. That spirit is the spirit of victory. It is the spirit that can never die. It is the spirit that will make Poland a great and glorious nation again.

General Sikorski was born in Tysow Narodowy, Galicia, on May 20, 1881, the son of a high-school teacher. His ancestors took part in the campaigns of Napoleon and in the Polish insurrection of 1830.

General Sikorski received his high-school education in Lwow and in 1908 took a degree in civil engineering at Lwow Technical University. He was drafted into the Austrian Army, served the compulsory year, 1905-6, and left the army with the rank of a second lieutenant.

He then took part in the Polish underground independence movement in Galicia, and during the First World War, when Marshal Pilsudski organized the Polish legions in Austria, he became one of the chief aides of the late marshal. He was named a lieutenant colonel and in 1916 became commander of the third regiment of the legions on the Russian-Austrian front in Volhynia with the rank of a colonel.

During the Polish-Ukrainian War in 1919 and during the Polish-Russian War in 1920 he was commander of an army corps. One of his exploits was repelling General Budenny's cavalry in the attack on Warsaw in 1920. After the war he was appointed in 1921 chief of the general staff, serving until December 16, 1922, the day the President of the Republic, Gabriel Narutowicz, was assassinated.

With a civil war threatening Poland, General Sikorski was appointed Prime Minister and Minister of Interior and

undertook the task of pacifying the country. His successor on the general staff was Marshal Pilsudski.

PREMIER UNTIL MAY 26, 1923

General Sikorski remained Premier until May 26, 1923. He restored order and succeeded in obtaining the recognition by the great powers of the Russian-Polish line of demarcation. After a vote of censure by the Diet he resigned, taking over command of another army corps.

On February 17, 1924, he was appointed Minister of War and organized the Polish Army. In the spring of 1925 he went to France, where Gen. Maxime Weygand, who served as military adviser to the Polish Army during the Polish-Russian war, became his intimate friend.

He advocated a close Polish-French policy, introducing French methods and armaments in the Polish Army and maintaining close friendship with many French generals and politicians. On November 14, 1925, he resigned as Minister of War and returned to active military service.

When Marshal Pilsudski carried out his coup d'état on May 13, 1926, General Sikorski was commander of the Lwow garrison and chief of the Southeastern Army. He disagreed with Pilsudski's policy and methods. The marshal dismissed him on March 22, 1928.

General Sikorski then went to France, where he wrote books and articles. After his return to Poland he was put under strict surveillance. He wrote many articles in foreign newspapers advocating a Polish-French alliance. In an article published on April 1, 1939, he warned that Germany was seeking to conquer the world.

#### ESCAPED GERMAN INVADERS

At the outbreak of the German-Polish war General Sikorski applied for active service but was not assigned. After Poland's defeat he fled to Rumania and from there to France. In September 1939, he was appointed chief commander of the Polish Legions. The next day he was made Premier of the Polish "Government of National Union" in exile.

On November 10, 1939, he was appointed generalissimo but kept his post as Premier. In 1941 General Sikorski came to the United States, where he had interviews with President Roosevelt and members of the Cabinet. Last December he made his third trip to the United States to confer with President Roosevelt and also visited Mexico.

At the time of his death Premier Sikorski was working on his two most immediate objectives, the doom of Adolf Hitler and the Axis and the restoration and promotion of friendly ties with Soviet Russia. He believed the defeat of Germany was much closer than many believed.

He was hopeful that normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, broken April 26 by Moscow, would soon be restored. He disclosed in Cairo last Friday that there had been a new move to reestablish diplomatic relations.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the shocking death of Gen. Wladyslaw

Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and Commander in Chief of the Polish Army, is a great loss to the God-fearing peoples of the world.

May the victory of the United Nations over our common enemies bring a well-earned reward to Poland for its faithfulness to her late leader, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, who gallantly fought for freedom and liberty. May Poland emerge from this war with its boundaries restored.

That was the aim of General Sikorski, and that is the aim of the God-fearing peoples of the world.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and grieved a moment ago to receive from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my first information that the great statesman, General Sikorski, is now lost to the world. I know all of you who have ever had the pleasure of meeting him or who are familiar with his career heartily share this grief and realization of the loss the world has suffered.

Along with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] I sat in those executive sessions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and marveled at the words of that distinguished gentleman as he sat across the table from me perfectly erect, thoroughly determined, and every inch a gentleman. I was so many times impressed that there was not only a great soldier and executive but a distinguished gentleman and patriot who was destined to contribute much to the future of his country and to the future of the world.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great moving spirits in the Allied cause is dead—a champion of freedom for 33 years and more, a Polish statesman and soldier with deep feeling for the tragedy of his homeland under Nazi conquest and with unwavering faith that victory for his cause is certain, and that the victory will be followed by a rebirth of Poland.

We who met and talked with General Wladyslaw Sikorski in Washington a few months ago are shocked to learn that the Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-exile, who was also the commander in chief of its armed forces, was killed last night when his plane crashed while he was on his way back to London from the Middle East.

Accompanying the general to death were other high officers and close associates of the Polish Army, and the general's daughter, who was a member of the Polish Auxiliary Territorial Service.

General Sikorski died in the very hour of fruition for plans long in development for participation of the free Poles in an invasion of Nazi-held Europe. He has been denied by death the opportunity and the privilege of again leading his countrymen into battle for liberty.

As an undergraduate civil engineer in central Poland, under the heel of Austria, he began his career in the cause of freedom, in the first decade of this century. He was the leader of a rifle society working for the liberation of Poland, in 1910. Subject to the Austrian draft at the beginning of the First World War, he ob-

tained a transfer to the Polish legions, and by 1916 he commanded a regiment.

By his patriotic activities he fell into the hands of the Austrian authorities, but he won release and led the Polish war against the Bolsheviks. In 1920 he was in an important command in the battle of Warsaw. In 1921 he became the Polish chief of staff.

When civil war threatened Poland in 1922, Sikorski was made Prime Minister, and while he served in that office Poland's first social insurance law was enacted. Later he became War Minister.

From 1926 to 1939 he was active in the military service of his nation. Then came the invasion of Poland by the hordes of Hitler.

It was lightning war, and Poland soon was overrun by the enemy. General Sikorski succeeded in escaping to England, and when the Polish Government-in-exile was established he was chosen as both Prime Minister and commander in chief.

In that position he traveled from London to Iran, where a large contingent of Polish troops has been stationed, and to Moscow and our Washington.

Now the forces which he has been organizing in the name of Poland to launch an offensive, together with their allied comrades against the Nazi fortifications of Europe, are ready for action; but their leader is dead.

General Sikorski will not be able to join the march to victory, nor will he enjoy the spectacle of a liberated Poland rebuilding for a better future.

But his spirit in death may lead as it would have in the living body of Sikorski. Poles everywhere, and the Allied world, pause this day in sorrow and in tribute to General and Prime Minister Sikorski, but tomorrow the spirit of the fighting Poles, which is the spirit of Sikorski, will move forward again to the battle stations.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise to pay my homage and respect to a great leader, General Sikorski. I have known that man many years; I knew him when Poland was regaining her strength after her other great trial and I know that Poland looked to him in the great trial through which she is now passing. I know that every person who ever knew General Sikorski admired and respected him. It will be difficult to find another man to fill his place, but I know that such a one will rise out of Poland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I too had the privilege of listening to General Sikorski as he talked to us across the table in our committee room. While telling us about the tragedy and suffering of Poland he appeared not only as a splendid soldier but also as a great statesman. I knew then that he was among the many great soldiers and statesmen that have contributed so heroically to the glory of Poland, giving inspiration and courage to the free men fighting fiercely for freedom everywhere in the world. I had an opportunity also to talk with him after the committee meeting. That was an



honor I shall always remember. The weight of his enormous burden was obvious but also was the fighting qualities of a determined soldier.

Mr. Speaker, this morning when I read the sad news of the death of General Sikorski, I realized, as we all do, that we must not pause for an instant in our fighting to bring this war to a victorious close as soon as possible. Yesterday we celebrated our freedom, our independence, our Fourth of July. Today General Sikorski's fight and Poland's fight for freedom, although not a fact at the moment, is certain of accomplishment. They have experienced their Valley Forge. Poland and the Allied Nations have lost some great men. But General Sikorski knew well that Poland and the Allies have many great statesmen, courageous soldiers, heroic men and women who will never give up until the enemy is unconditionally defeated and the torch of freedom is burning brightly on the high altar of peace, inspiring goodwill and faith again in the hearts of men.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.)

#### OVEROPTIMISM OUR REAL WAR DANGER TODAY

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread and a growing danger throughout our Nation. As Representatives of our people we shall fail our duty if we do not take active steps to counteract it. I speak of the grave peril born of the belief that this war is practically won. Such wishful and completely unfounded daydreaming is actually imperiling our armed forces as they prepare to carry the attack to our enemies.

That belief has translated itself into overemphasis of post-war thinking, absenteeism, relaxation, and a general slackening of effort that sent the production of arms and ammunition down for the month of May. All indications are that the figures for June will be none too good. This is in the face of the absolute necessity that our armament program be stepped up and up throughout all of 1943.

Do we lack imagination as a people? Must we wait for the casualty lists to roll in before we will believe that it is going to cost us dearly to crack and penetrate the fortress of Nazi-held Europe and the Jap dominated network of the Pacific. Seventeen million heavily armed enemy

fighting men are not going to be wished out of existence. Nor if we listen to the words of a man who is in a position to know, will we hope that our enemies can be brought to submission through bombing alone.

I quote from General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army:

I think it proper to express a word of caution against hasty conclusions or impromptu conceptions regarding the utilization of air power or any special weapon in the conduct of this war. I am convinced more and more each day that only by a proper combination of war-making means can we achieve victory in the shortest possible time and with the greatest economy in life. Pantelleria was an experiment, for which there appeared to be, and proved to be a sound logical basis. However, the situation there was unique as to the character of the island, the quality of the garrison, the complete naval control of the surrounding waters, and the proximity of allied airfields. The victory of Tunisia was favored by overwhelming air power, but the result would have been a stalemate without aggressive ground and naval action.

Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the ground army, with infantry and artillery as important as tanks and antiaircraft, and engineer and signal troops vital to the whole.

Such a closely knit combination of power and driving force cannot be possible if great segments are to fall short of requirements.

I again quote. This time from the Honorable Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War:

The War Department is concerned over the Army production situation.

Production in May of matériel for the ground forces supply program, which was scheduled to rise 2 percent from \$1,553,000,000 in April to \$1,582,000,000 in May, actually declined 3½ percent to \$1,494,000,000.

This 5½ percent failure of production in dollars reflects a much more grave situation when considered in terms of actual arms, ammunition, and equipment which was not delivered to the Army. This means that troops in training must be deprived of critical equipment in order to supply troops being shipped overseas and those already overseas. If this situation continues, even our overseas troops will suffer from shortages of critical equipment.

The Army has the men and the transportation. Industry has the men and materials. Management and labor must deliver the supplies on schedule and as planned, or the opportunity to exploit recent military successes will be lost.

This is the most critical period in military supply. "Too little and too late" now will cost hundreds of thousands of lives tomorrow.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces, commenting on this falling off in production has said:

The overconfidence which caused a great part of the let-down was the result of several factors. Favorable news from the battle fronts caused many to conclude that victory is now just around the corner, and that feeling took some of the fire and determination away from many industrial leaders, workers, and large segments of the public.

It is tragic indeed that this should happen, for the victories which brought about the overconfidence and resultant let-up in pro-

duction, actually created an increasingly urgent need for the equipment which failed to come off the production line because of the let-down. The Tunisian victory, coming earlier than many conservative estimates held to be possible, speeded up the day of European invasion with all it will require in men, weapons, and matériel. It paved the way for us to sweep the enemy from the Mediterranean. By shortening our supply lines the time needed for each cargo ship to make a delivery was considerably reduced. This was equivalent to adding hundreds of thousands of tons of capacity to our cargo fleets. The vastly increased amount of shipping space thus made available requires that we have the weapons and supplies ready to load into it. If the weapons are not ready, invasion cannot be carried out on schedule, and such a delay means prolonging the war at the needless cost of lives of our troops.

Germany and Japan have been put on the defensive. Put there by the miracle of the combined power of our great production and our military forces. Failure to sustain that miracle—failure to increase it at this moment will be a tragedy. This is the time to surge forward with new vigor and increase of effort. It is not the time to lean back and congratulate ourselves. We must assure a victory that cannot, must not stop short of complete and unconditional surrender of our foes.

Our way is clear; as representatives of our people who must be united in this effort. We must crush these false illusions. If this war is stalemated and prolonged through smug and erroneous concepts of a victory already assured we shall pay a ghastly price. We shall pay with needlessly wasted lives of our fighting men and we shall have lost forever all hope of preserving the fabric of freedom, of enterprise, of labor, of thought, or movement, in short of virtually all freedom and liberty itself.

Too many of us have forgotten those days when Mr. Hitler was beating his breast and crying out to the world that America was weak and that democracy could not fight a successful total war. These words were not words of oratory alone. Knowing the power of the armies that he had built under slavery, he was convinced he was speaking the truth. Since Pearl Harbor we have thrown that lie back into his teeth through a unity that Hitler and his cohorts could not even imagine. But now we must realize that we stand at the very crisis of our effort. Now those sacrifices we were going to be called upon to make are here and very real. For the first time we have seen signs that our home front is seriously lagging in meeting the challenge. If we are the voices of our people we must raise these voices to cry out against this threat. God forbid that the minor triumphs we have accomplished destroy what we have built. I charge you as Members of this great body with the individual duty to combat with every word, thought, and deed this first real threat to our war to victory and freedom.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. McKENZIE and Mr. COMPTON asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members now who have claimed time under special orders. The Chair thinks that in all probability the conference report will be ready around 6:15 or 6:30.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 6 minutes.

## CONGRESSIONAL RECESS AND THE HOME FRONT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to complete a portion of its work and the Members will go home to their districts. At the outset may I say that I am very far from making one of those familiar speeches just before a time like this when somebody gets up and says: "Mr. Speaker, we ought not to recess until we have taken care of thus-and-so." I can think of several things I would like to see the House do, but I am sure that the most important thing for all the membership of this House is to go home. For my part it has been impossible for me to be in my district since last fall. I know that when I am able to go home it is going to do me a great deal of good. It is going to bring me some basic encouragement just as it always does because I am going to find that fundamentally there is something very solid, very true, and very dependable in the hearts of those people.

It so happens, strangely enough, that the note I most wanted to strike in these few moments is practically the same as that which the gentleman from Alabama just struck except that I want to apply it in a little different way.

It is my conviction that we have not yet learned to act on the problems of our home front as we would do if the fires of this war had burned as deeply into our souls as they will before we are through. I do not think that to a sufficient extent small and minor, petty considerations, wrangling and conflict have been done away with. And I am afraid that to some degree that fact reflects itself in some of the violent conflicts we have seen in various parts of our country in recent weeks. If there is one thing that ought to be overcome so far as every one of us is concerned, and I am not making preachment here to anybody else any more than I am to myself, it is the tendency on the part of economic groups and organizations, political groups and organizations, yes and even Members of Congress, to try to lay the blame for things that go wrong on somebody else. For one thing we have got to see the need of a spirit of unity and comradeship among all who truly love this country. And a very good way to start in bringing this about is by each person asking himself the question: "Where have I fallen down and where have I been wrong?" not where the other fellow has been. When Members go home to their districts one of the main things they are going to try to do is to find out what it is that the people most desire.

I think we are going to find certain things. We are going to find, first, the

people saying: "We want, more than anything else, a clarification of some of these issues. We do not know quite where we stand on things, and we are not quite certain what the Government's policy is about them."

## FUNDAMENTAL ANSWER TO INFLATION

I do not want to prophesy, but I am certain that many of us will come back with the conviction that one of the things the people desire more than anything else is a specific declaration on the part of the Congress as to what the policy of this Government is going to be with regard to the control of inflation and with regard to the stabilization of our economy in this country. I think it would be well for us to ask our people this question: Whether they would prefer, on the one hand, the continuation of a tremendous effort on the part of the O. P. A. to control in intimate detail, as it is now attempting to do, the price levels of this country, or whether they would prefer to see this Congress enact such legislation in the form of taxation plus a compulsory-savings program so as to attack the inflation problem at its root and to be able thereafter to put a stop completely to the sale of bonds to commercial banks for the new money which they create, thus causing inflation and adding immeasurably to the national debt. We have little right, Mr. Speaker, to criticize O. P. A. or other Government agencies when, as some Members have done, the only "remedy" proposed is to so cripple the agency by cutting its appropriation as to render it even more difficult for it or the local boards to handle their job. But we have our choice between attacking this problem at its root in the manner I have described or doing the best we can with an admittedly difficult situation and taking our share of the medicine and the trouble that comes instead of laying it all at somebody else's door.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If those steps were taken, namely, on taxation and savings and the elimination of commercial-bank financing, does the gentleman agree with me that the O. P. A. would be absolutely unnecessary?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman 90 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is close enough.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason I do not make that 100 percent is because the tremendous draft of the war demand on certain commodities might, and, I think, would, in the case of monopolistic control of some commodities, make it necessary to use some means to prevent those particular groups from taking undue advantage and charging far more than they should for the things under their control. Aside from that if you had those things in effect the O. P. A. as a pricing agency would become largely unnecessary. I said that very thing the day we passed the first Price Control Act.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. You would have to have rationing? Under any plan you would have to have rationing of food?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, as long as the war lasts you would have to ration, because as soon as you have a scarcity of commodities which the people need it is the only fair way to get them distributed. Inflation and the increased cost of living are two different things, not the same thing. Increased wages and increased farm prices are not the cause of inflation. The cause of inflation is the fact that there is more money put into circulation than there are consumers' goods to buy with it. These other things are the result.

## POLICY FOR FAIR STABILIZATION

In the second place, if those fundamental steps are taken you could achieve a stabilization on the basis of fairness and justice by applying three simple rules: First, tie wages to the cost of living, as has been done successfully in other nations. Say that wages shall not increase unless the cost of living increases, but that there will be an increase in wages if the cost of living increases. In other words, we take the responsibility. Further, we have to make a distinction between those wages which have increased substantially and sometimes very largely, and the income of many other workers and salaried people that have not increased at all. There should be different treatment in these two cases.

As to farm prices, I think we should lay it down as the principle that under no circumstances shall any incentive or subsidy payments be made in lieu of or as a partial substitute for fair and just parity prices in the market to the farmer. But if necessary to gain increased production over and beyond what those prices can make possible for the farmer to produce, or if necessary to secure unusual crops needed for the war, then, beyond that fair parity price or support price or whatever standards might be set, it must be possible to make such payments to the producer himself as will enable him to produce those things but without increased prices to the consumer.

In the third place, as far as the subsidization is concerned—I say this very frankly and as one who voted to sustain the President's veto the other day because I thought that bill was much too broad—I do believe that instead of a broad, generalized subsidy affecting all persons throughout the Nation, many of whom, including people like ourselves, ought to sacrifice some of their standard of living as a very small contribution to this war, it would be much more to the point to say that as to those groups of people whose incomes have not been increased, as, for example, the dependents of soldiers whom we provide with certain allotments—and certainly we are responsible for the purchasing power of that money—and as to a number of other



groups of people, we will make it possible for their purchasing power to be increased per dollar by some adaptation on a sound basis of the stamp plan which we have already worked out and used practically for a long time.

#### FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I want to say also that I think when we go home we are going to find our people in overwhelming percentage in favor of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], which in simple and direct terms states that the United States is not going to make the same mistakes that were made after the last war, but that this time we will keep faith with the men who are fighting and giving their lives and will build a lasting peace in their names.

Mr. Speaker, recently I sent many thousands of copies of a questionnaire out to my district. I got more than 3,200 replies, although people had to make out a very long questionnaire with 33 questions on it, and pay postage on their replies. I put a summary of those replies in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3371.

Among those questions was one where the wording was almost exactly the wording of the Fulbright resolution, although I had never read it. More people answered that question than any other question in the questionnaire. Of those who answered, 96 percent said they were in favor of the United States participating in an international organization and an international machinery after this war for the prevention of future aggression and future wars.

#### WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE HOME FRONT?

And now I want to speak generally about our home-front problem.

Times without number we have heard it said that American fighting men are winning the war on the battlefields of the world, but that the war might be lost on the home front.

Times without number we have also heard dark prophecies to the effect that, whereas we are going to win the war in a military sense, we may well lose the peace and hence fail to gain the hopes and ideals for which we now fight.

Why should these things be?

I have thought about it a great deal, and I believe I know the answer. I have suggested it already. We do not yet feel how deep this crisis is. Selfishness still stalks the land; men still contend with one another over small and mean issues; the hand of each group is set against other groups; the old fights and issues we will not leave behind, for they are easy and appealing and familiar. We so far have simply been unwilling to live and think and act as if we stand at one of the greatest—if not the very greatest—turning points in the whole history of the world. Too many of us here at home are acting as if we could take military victory in this war absolutely for granted. And we cannot. Even if we could be certain of military victory we have as yet no solid ground on which to base a belief that we who occupy positions of responsi-

bility at home are going to be completely true to the trust every soldier must put in us to do our part to win the peace and to be prepared to solve by democratic means the domestic problems that will follow after it.

It is too often "the other fellow's fault"—not ours. And we act in too many instances almost as if it were more important to prove the other fellow wrong than for America to be strong and hopeful and united in her hour of great-trial.

It is strong medicine and there are one or two sentences in it with which I do not agree but I am going to read to the House at this point an editorial which appeared recently in the Saturday Review of Literature. It reads as follows:

There is something curiously paradoxical today in the changed relationship between the book and film world and the everyday world in which Americans live. Once—and not many years ago at that—many of us picked up a book or went to the movies for an hour or two of escape. But the war has reversed that. Today we live in what is actually a world of escape and take a brief dip into reality every now and then in our diversions.

When you read on-the-spot reports such as Guadalcanal Diary, by Richard Tregaskis, or Men of Bataan, by John Hersey, or Queens Die Proudly, by W. L. White, or One World, by Wendell Willkie; or even books of fiction such as The Dead Look On, by Gerald Kersh, or The Voice of the Trumpet, by Robert Henriques—when you read these books you are strangely lifted out of the fantastic and unreal world that is America today and plumped into a world of substance and reality, a world where basic values are at stake, where blood is flowing in mounting torrents to keep the meaning of America alive.

The contrast is even more striking with motion pictures—perhaps because the film is a much more compact and dramatically effective vehicle than books. You go to see a film such as In Which We Serve, or Desert Victory, or Prelude to War, and come away dazed and blinking—dazed because your brief excursion into the real world of 1943 has been full of raw stuff; blinking because it is difficult to get adjusted again to the world you actually have to live in and work in. This world is much different from the one you have seen when it took shape on the screen. This world—that is, the American world today—is an incredible world which no word describes so aptly and tragically as the word "escape"—in the sense that we are detached from the needs of the present.

Does "escape" seem too harsh when applied to America? How else would you describe a nation that is in a fight to the death yet thinks it can afford the luxury of interminable wrangling, pulling, tugging? How else would you describe a nation where there are men in Congress who regard as their main enemy not Hitler but the President of the United States, and who count as a supreme triumph anything that will embarrass, hamstring, or obstruct him? How else would you describe a nation where the abolition of Government agencies, regardless of the nature of their work or their urgency on the war front or home front or both, is eagerly sought by the congressional blocs not to expedite the war against Germany and Japan but to expedite the war against a competing political party? How else would you describe a nation where efforts to stabilize wages and prices and taxes are constantly thwarted because each group wants the other group to make whatever sacrifices have to be made;

where organized pressure groups are relentlessly grubbing and grabbing whatever they can while the getting is good? And finally, how else would you describe a nation where there are race riots and devastating and irresponsible strikes.

Don't take comfort in the notion that this is the democratic way. This is not the democratic way, unless we are to say that the democratic way is disintegration and insanity. There is always a wide margin in democracy for cleavages and divergences; indeed, in normal times democracy thrives on them. But there comes a time when the margin must shrink, when differences must be subordinated to common resolution in the face of a common danger. To stray far out beyond the margin, to allow what are really minor differences to become magnified and intensified to the point where more important issues are side-tracked or obscured; to obstruct or impede the national welfare because of petty politics or prejudice—all this is inexplicable treason.

Yet the profoundly disturbing reality is that this is the picture of America today—a nation which has yet to grasp the imperatives of the hour. There is no home front in the sense that there is a solid wall of resistance. There is no such wall and we may as well face it. Selfishness, shortsightedness, stubbornness have eaten into the wall and have left big, gaping openings. Armies can win battles and nothing more. It is the nation as a whole which alone can prove its ability to survive.

Can it be that when it comes to a showdown we haven't got what it takes? Can it be that a nation born in the blood of freedom's battle has so far wandered from its heritage as to be ignorant of the bold requirements of continued freedom and self-preservation? Can it be that all these internal explosions will serve only to pave the way for the destruction, demolition, or overthrow of American democracy at home without a single enemy shell, bullet, or bomb touching our shores? If so, we had better call the boys home now, for there is nothing left for them to save.—N. C.

We are fighting this war to preserve the opportunity of people to be free. We are fighting it to build a world wherein the ideas that made Hitler possible, that made Japanese imperialism and deceit possible cannot exist. We are fighting again to keep democracy alive in the world. But it is not democracy to quarrel over position and rank and public approval when the enemy is at the gates.

It is an old, old tradition of Anglo-Saxon peoples that they do not fear in time of common danger to lay aside their quarrels, to give up the indulgence of selfishness or self-will or self-righteousness, and, accepting such leadership as they have, to go forward together with spirit until the danger has been passed. Through the years we have done this. And we have not doubted but that the freedom and peacetime ways we temporarily laid down would be taken up again as soon as the war was won.

So far in this war it has for some reason been different. Many millions of the people of the country have followed the tradition. But they have seen with consternation many others fail to do it. They have sometimes seen Congress fail to do it; they have sometimes seen officials of the executive branch of the Government fail to do it. They have seen one organized economic group after an-

other fail to rise above its own self-interest.

Part of this is due to years through which some Americans have developed habits of thought and action which simply do not fit with the war needs of our Nation. For example, Republican Middle Western William Allen White a few days ago wrote editorially in his *Emporia Gazette* as follows:

#### WHO RUNS THE WAR?

It is silly to say New Dealers run this war show. It's run largely by absentee owners of amalgamated industrial wealth, men who either directly or through their employers control small minority blocks, closely organized, that manipulate the physical plants of these trusts. Also, for the most part, these managerial magnates whom one meets in Washington are decent Americans. For the most part, they are giving to the American people superb service. They have great talents. If you touch them in 9 relations of life out of 10, they are kindly, courteous, Christian gentlemen. But in the tenth relation, where it touches their own organization, they are stark mad, ruthless, unchecked by God or man, paranoiacs, in fact, as evil in their designs as Hitler. They are determined to come out of this war victors for their own stockholders. \* \* \* This attitude of the men who control the great commodity industries and who propose to run them according to their own judgment and their own morals does not make a pretty picture for the welfare of the common man. These international combinations of industrial capital are fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous power and no social brains. They hover like the old Silurian reptiles about our decent, more or less Christian, civilization like great dragons in this modern day when dragons are supposed to be dead.

There Editor White puts his finger, I believe, on the reason we are short of metals, short of steel, for instance, and I could document that story if I had time.

Not that Americans today are bad or dishonest or that they do not love their country enough to give their own or their sons' lives for it. It is not that. It is simply that we have not yet learned to love her enough to sacrifice our past short-sightedness and prejudice and selfishness in her cause.

#### SOMETIMES IT'S NOT THE OTHER FELLOW'S FAULT

Nor will we be doing that until we see—until every economic group and individual, every political organization, and every civic organization sees—that other people are sometimes right; that the people as a whole are almost always right and that on the other hand the group or organization they belong to is sometimes wrong—and so are we as individuals.

#### WHY BUREAUCRATS?

We have become experts in laying blame on somebody else. The bureaucrats, for example. They have made plenty of mistakes, some of them have been arrogant with Members of Congress, and—what is worse—with the American people. There are probably too many of them in some agencies.

But, after all, without certain governmental controls and direction we could not fight the war at all. We have just

got to make the best of the war and its exactions upon us all. And repeatedly I have sat here in the House and listened to Members get up and castigate certain agencies, because they have not done a better job, and then turn right around and propose to cut the appropriation for the agency so severely that it would be quite impossible for them to do a good job. This is neither fair nor responsible action. If an agency is not doing a good enough job, what it needs is better personnel; not worse than what it has. If we are angry about black markets, maybe the O. P. A. needs more competent people to do enforcement work. But the remedy proposed is that they have less people. And then, no doubt, there will be more criticism—a good deal of it justified, perhaps—and more blame put upon O. P. A. when part of the fault lies in a penny-wise, pound-foolish attitude right here.

Furthermore, it is well to remember as I said earlier that the reason we have O. P. A. controlling the whole price economy of America is because of certain things Congress has not done. At present not one Member would dare seriously propose that we do away with O. P. A. So some of us just propose to make it inefficient. Does that make sense?

But there is—there always has been another way. It is to apply the one basic cure for inflation, which is taxes and compulsory saving and appropriate monetary policy. Take constructive action here and then we can talk about sharply curtailing O. P. A.'s functions and reduce the number of bureaucrats safely.

On November 25, 1941, when the original Price Control Act was under consideration, I said this to the House:

In all honesty I must say that if we do nothing to increase the supply of consumer goods and if we do nothing to establish a stable and dependable, not to say a constitutional, monetary system, then an attempt to set up a Government bureau and tell it to control prices and prevent inflation is going to be like telling that bureau to sit on a steam safety valve with the fires at white heat and new fuel being added under the boilers. It is one thing to set up an agency to prevent certain prices from soaring way above all the rest of them. That we probably must do. But it is quite another thing to try to control the whole price level by means of government decisions and rulings.

If, therefore, we want to really prevent inflation, we have got to do things that will attack it in fundamental fashion and which will be as effective in preventing deflation in the future as they are in preventing inflation now. If we could increase the output of goods and bring it up even with the supply of dollars we have to buy goods with, that would be a real answer. And if we could establish a monetary and credit system based on sound principles which would keep the supply of buying power always in line with and geared to the production of goods for sale, then we would have the problem solved—not only for this crisis but for all time to come.

But what, you ask, should be done at a time when real inflation might threaten, when prices did start to go up seriously? Remembering the definitions I have given, there would be two things to do: First, not to create any more new money or credit un-

til increasing production of goods caught up with the money supply, and, second, to levy such taxes as would be effective in reducing the amount of money in circulation so as to bring the prices back to normal. That is very important, for, after all is said and done, this method—balancing money creation and taxes in proper proportion—is the sound way, the only sound way, to prevent inflation and deflation. If we will use this way, we will be building a system that can absolutely prevent deflation after this thing is over. And that is quite as important as preventing inflation now. Under these circumstances all that would be needed in the way of price-control legislation would be, as I have said, a measure enabling ceilings to be put on special prices which, without any sound reason, are jacked up beyond the general level of other prices. That would not be dangerous, and in the emergency it might do a lot of good. And, most important, with the kind of monetary system I have described it would be successful.

Our country is in the midst of a total war which has inevitably twisted our domestic economy completely out of shape. We must expect to employ extraordinary means in at least some instances to achieve the necessary result of girding our Nation to fight this total war successfully. The fundamental things are appropriate taxes and compulsory savings. They can really stop inflation, for they can be used as substitutes for having the banks create the billions of dollars of new money they are now creating. We face a twofold problem. First, we must get full production, especially of food, and we must provide the necessary incentives to get it. Second, we have millions of consumers whose incomes have not increased a bit since the war and to whom we owe a duty to see they do not bear the whole burden of rising living costs. There are, however, right and wrong ways to use subsidies and they are altogether likely to be inflationary in their effect unless used with extreme caution.

I am frank to say I do not like the idea of subsidizing the entire Nation generally out of the Public Treasury. I am not opposed, however, to the use of incentive payments direct to producers to obtain needed production, so long as such payments are never used to hold a price to the farmer below a fair parity price. Nor am I opposed to providing assistance for low-income or fixed-income consumers, such as soldiers dependent on allowances we provided, veterans, old-age pensioners, white-collar workers, and similar groups who have thus far borne the whole weight of increased living costs. But these groups could be fairly dealt with, as I previously pointed out, through some such device as a revival of the stamp plan as a means of meeting this particular need and problem.

Congress may well be correct in opposing some of the proposals of the Executive, but Congress will be dead wrong if it does not substitute therefor a constructive proposal of its own in every case.

#### HOME-FRONT PROBLEM IS ONE PROBLEM

We need to consider the problem of our home front as a whole—as one problem, not a lot of separate ones.



We need a policy as to wages. I have suggested such a policy. Perhaps someone can improve upon it. But above all we should define a policy.

A policy—a workable and a fair one—as to farm prices is needed. That, too, I have tried to outline very briefly. And we need an answer for consumers; that is, for the lower income consumers.

One policy is to freeze everything. It has been talked of a good deal. I do not see how it can be done, however, short of drafting the whole economy—men and machines, factories, mines, and money—for the service of the Nation. Even that step we should not fear too much if it is needed to save our Nation.

But short of that there are other ways, I believe, to solve the problem. They are not soft or easy or popular. But they will work.

I use the specific cases only as examples. But they are taken from the problem that is our No. 1 wartime job on the home front—namely, provision of a fair return to all without letting an inflationary spiral get started.

#### WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

There is something else—something every soldier thinks of when he is not thinking about the war itself and his chance of survival. It is preparation now for the problems of the post-war world. I hoped most earnestly that before the recess we would act to set up a congressional agency to deal with that problem. We have destroyed the National Reserves Planning Board. The problem is squarely in the lap of Congress. To neglect it is not only to risk confusion and Executive dictation as to measures to be taken to meet the economic problems of the post-war period. To neglect it is to break faith with every man in uniform. As soon as we return I believe we will act on this, for I believe we will find the people demanding it.

#### WHAT HITLER AND THE JAPS WANT

I close where I began. If there is one thing Hitler and the Japanese overlords might wish above all things else, it is strife and conflict among us here in America. Nothing can help them quite so much as our refusal to be as big people—as big in attitude and mind and soul—as the times demand. Nothing can help the enemies of America as much as our failure to sacrifice pettiness and prejudice and selfishness and attachment to that which is small and unimportant. For it is out of people's failure to purge these things from their hearts in the fires of war that there arise fruitless and unnecessary political conflict, riot, and bloodshed in our streets, racial and class antagonisms.

Where have I been wrong?

Where have I failed to do my part?

Wherein have I been less a true patriot than I should have been?

These are the questions that must be asked throughout this land and in this Congress. We must ask them about ourselves, not about other people. This is where we have fallen down.

There will be time to fix blame. There will be time to look to our rights. But that time is not now.

I am not interested in what is past. I am not concerned as to whose fault has caused some of the conflict on our home front. All I want to say today is that every one of us is in part to blame if we have not seen clearly the tremendous issues of this war, if we have not stood so appalled by the vast significance of this world-wide task in which we play a part if we have not learned to look upon every other loyal American as a fellow worker in that task and willingly sacrificed to our country not alone our blood and treasure, but every minor conflict among us, every petty wrangle, every short-sighted or selfish consideration as well, for these things are the roots of our trouble. They are what is wrong with the Home Front.

Millions of men are fighting and dying for this country. Other millions of men and women are working long and tedious hours in the field and factories. Mothers are bearing children, rearing them under the difficulties of wartime to be the Americans of the future.

America's future and America's present hope is in the heart and mind and muscles and skills and hopes and aspirations of the people. These things are real. The problems are real. The terrible danger of this war is real.

And whoever, therefore, fails to work with all his might against every force and every tendency that divides our people or causes conflict among them in these desperate days fails in his duty to his country. I do not speak to others more than to myself. Nor do I believe we will fail. What I do believe is that gradually, throughout this Nation, a new spirit will come out of the very trouble of the time—a spirit as broad as America, and as noble as the ideals that made her strong and free.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### HUMANITY MUST NOT BE DENIED THE FRUITS OF VICTORY

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, this is the day on which most of the country has commemorated the Nation's birthday, the Fourth of July having been Sunday. On days like these it is customary to send our greetings to the boys at the battle front. It is proper that we should do so. If I may, however, I should like to suggest that final victory rests here, not there. Here in these Halls final victory will be determined. Here we shall say whether they fight in vain.

"The Congress shall have power," the Constitution says, "to raise and support armies." And so, by the labor and pain of debate, we give birth to a great army. We cheer the boys. We vote them medals. We raise their pay. We brag how well we feed them, nurse them, arm them. We vote dollars in a grand manner. But do we support them? The coming days will tell.

Yesterday I learned that a young major, in truth a boy of 27, had died in gallant action somewhere in the southern seas. He was only one of the eight or possibly ten million men and boys—

yes, and girls—of my land who may face enemy fire before the year ends. For what? To avenge?

As they fight, others fall and the mountain of sacrifice grows and grows. Pearl Harbor. Bataan on Pearl Harbor. Guadalcanal on Bataan. Kasserine on Guadalcanal. Attu on Kasserine Pass. And from the enemy prisons word comes that 600 have died who waited in vain for aid to reach the Philippines. Each death cries for more. Vengeance is the cruelest mockery devised in the name of war.

The boy whose death I learned yesterday—what did he die for? To be avenged? No; he died to make mankind itself free from the scourge of war.

"I do not want to die," one boy wrote his mother, "but I shall not mind too much; I shall not care about my dreams if the next crop of boys can have theirs."

Can it be that twice in our generation a crop of youth will die in vain? It is inconceivable. Some counseled isolation. Some intervention. What matters which, now? We armed. War came. These boys give up their dreams and go out to fight. And they do fight. And they die.

Is there one among us who will not do all that he can to see they do not die in vain?

In my part of the West people still living remember when each man was his own law. A day came, however, when a few men said, "The time has come for law and order. We all expect to live here. We are all part of this community." Those men accepted the responsibility of making life and property safe; yes, and of making safe the dreams which young men have. Can we do less when nations come of age? Can we do less when our earth becomes a small world?

The boy of whose death I learned yesterday was only 7 when first I knew him. Must boys forever die at 27 or 17 or 37 because older men fail to translate battle-field victories into agreements that can endure?

When a child learns to walk, he does not skip, dance, and run. He takes one step at a time, a simple step. Should not nations walk together before they run? Let us take simple steps. Let us make simple commitments. Why should we not proceed as men did when they established law and order in a frontier community? They simply said that they would maintain order and that they would provide law and courts of justice. They did not say that changes could never be made. They merely said that ways would be found to handle disputes without bloodshed.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility upon this Congress is not discharged when we pass a draft law nor even when we pass the largest appropriation bills in history. The responsibility upon us to support our armies is to protect the victories they win. To support them is not merely to feed them and arm them; it is to write agreements which will let the nations of the world live without war.

Simple steps have been suggested in resolutions now before the Congress. Let them be explained to our people this summer and let us make clear that they

do not commit this Nation to any vast, involved scheme of national disintegration or international entanglement. The favored proposals, as I understand them, in effect, merely say two things; and in the form to be finally enacted we can make sure they say only two things:

First. That we will join with other nations of good will to maintain order; which means and should mean that anyone who breaks the peace will be punished, including those guilty for today's terrible crime.

Second. That we will join with other nations of like mind to provide law. That means a little machinery. It should not be too complicated, not too elaborate. There should be assurance of a forum for the discussion of problems that threaten the common peace. There should be a place for nations to refer differences they cannot settle alone.

Beyond these things it would not be wise now to go. Our task is not easy. We must not make it more difficult than it is. We must not allow ourselves to focus attention upon points of disagreement; we must apply ourselves to the things we have in common. People work together only when they have a common purpose and when they work on matters in which they find a common interest. Nations will learn to live together in the same way. We must try to succeed.

In our own national development, we took one step at a time. Committees of correspondence acquainted the colonies with each other before they formed the Continental Congress. Independence was maintained under the Articles of Confederation for several years before the Constitution came to form a more perfect union. In the international field, why try to take more than one step at a time?

Mr. Speaker, in venturing to raise my voice on this subject today, I do it in all humility but in all sincerity.

I was part of that other crop of boys who went out to the great adventure in 1917 and 1918, fanatical in our desire to win a war we were told was the war to end war. Scores, yes hundreds, of other men in this body were in that class. We came back, most of us unscarred.

Now we have seen this new generation go out to finish the job we did not. Yes, we have sent them out to do it, and to die if need be in doing it. And it will not be wrong that they have gone again if we finish the job this time. It will not be tragedy if we do our part in the parliaments and the council chambers of the world. The tragedy—and it would be of all the worst, the unforgivable tragedy—if the destruction of this war, the outpouring of wealth, and the sacrifice of young lives should be in vain.

It will be tragedy, Mr. Speaker, only if having paid the costs, humanity is denied the fruits of victory—a world freed from the scourge of war.

**WE WILL DISCOVER WHEN WE GO HOME THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL FORCES OF DEMOCRACY ARE COMING UP FROM THE PEOPLE**

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one or two suggestions to the Members of the House who are going home. It is necessary to go home once in a while and get a contact with the folks who have us hired, to see what the boss has to say. When you get home this time you will be surprised, if you have not been home lately, to discover how smart the boss is, how soundly he is thinking, how clear his notions are with regard to some of the things that need to be done. To me, that is the most fascinating thing connected with this remarkable period in which we are now in responsibility, and the most hopeful.

It seems to me that anybody who has studied the nature of democratic government, the influences which control its policies, and the thing which must guide it, should know that it has been provided in nature clearly that human beings may be free, that they may operate systems of self-government. That was not decided by those who met in the Federal Constitutional Convention; it was decided by God Almighty in the Counsels of Infinite Wisdom. There is nothing accidental about it at all.

The thing that has been provided for the guidance of free people is public opinion. You may think that a great statesman determines public policies. There is definitely a place for leadership, but many of the so-called great statesmen see the thing moving and get in ahead and grab the flag.

Every student of the fundamental forces that control government, that renew democracy, must know that the strength that renews democracy comes from the bottom up, from the body of the people. That fact is fascinating. I am talking about something that we must understand and be respectful to if we are to preserve a democratic government in these involved and complex situations in which human beings now live. We have reached the end when intelligent human beings depend upon the guidance of government by the theories of men. I do not think there is a bit of doubt about it. I have been here 30 years and I have been studying this. As far as I know all other people who have studied the thing have arrived at the same conclusion that operating a great system of democratic government is a practical thing, not a theory. It is a serious business. Governments, like every other thing that human beings can discover on earth, are governed by natural laws. It is strange we do not recognize that as a practical proposition.

The would-be physician goes to school for a long time to learn the laws of God Almighty that govern the human body. There used to be two sorts of doctors when I was a kid. One was the physician, the real doctor, who had studied these laws. When he went out to attend anyone who was sick he tried to find out what was the matter with the sick person. He did not ask what he wanted, but he prescribed that which his examination

indicated should be prescribed, and that which was the sort of thing the patient needed, and the sick person took the medicine whether it tasted good or not. He wanted to get well. The quack was the fellow who had a quick, sure, pleasant remedy, no matter what was wrong with the patient. He tried to find out what kind of medicine the patient wanted and he prescribed it. He drove around with a sporty team and wore a silk hat and did lots of advertising, and also gave a lot of dope to keep the people from knowing they were hurting. Of course, there are not many folks here now of the quack class in this body, but I have seen once in a while one or two people in public life who tried to find out what the people wanted and who said to them, "Boys, just give me your support and I will not only give you what you want but I will give you more of the same sort."

The people seem to be catching on to the fact that those operating a system of democratic government have got to determine what is the thing that is needed to be done, and then do it, whether it is easy or not, and must permit statesmen to sit in the councils of the Nation instead of quacks and tell them what they honestly believe, just as they would expect a real doctor to act. We will find some mighty encouraging indications when we go home insofar as the recovery of democratic fitness on the part of the people is concerned. Mighty encouraging it is to those of us who really believe in democratic government, a government by the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 108, 162, and 163.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 96, 99, 154½, 155, and 157; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,270,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree



to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,350,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That appropriations heretofore made"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Shasta Dam, reservoir and power plant, \$10,900,000; Keswick Dam and power plant, \$1,474,000; Friant Dam and Reservoir, \$595,000; transmission line to Shasta substation, \$400,000; Friant-Kern Canal, \$7,000,000; Madera Canal, \$1,000,000; Contra Costa Canal, \$500,000; Contra Costa laterals, \$500,00; and examinations, surveys, and water rights, \$200,000; in all, \$22,569,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$865,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 9 of said amendment strike out the figure "\$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$64,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "twenty-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,170,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 113, 119, and 156.

JED JOHNSON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
W. F. NORRELL,  
ALBERT E. CARTER,  
ROBERT F. JONES,  
BEN F. JENSEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
ELMER THOMAS,  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
GERALD P. NYE,  
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

No. 15: Provides that \$3,270,000 of the unobligated balance of funds available to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for operating and marketing expenses, instead of \$3,200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$3,287,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, and 105, relating to construction of reclamation projects from the reclamation fund. Appropriates the following amounts for the projects set forth below.

Boise project, Idaho (Payette Division) .....	Amount
Deschutes project, Oregon .....	\$100,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California .....	100,000
Riverton project, Wyoming .....	420,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming (Heart Mountain Division) .....	100,000

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, and 118, relating to construction of reclamation projects, general fund. Appropriates the following amounts for certain projects from the general fund as set forth below:

Central Valley project, California .....	Amount
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado .....	\$22,569,000
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch .....	3,500,000
Tucumcari project, New Mexico .....	3,000,000
Yakima project, Washington, Roza Division .....	500,000
	865,000

No. 120. Appropriates \$64,000 for water conservation and utilization projects, instead of \$4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided, together with the unexpended balance carried over from the fiscal year 1943, will make a total of \$5,000,000 available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1944.

Nos. 154½, 155, 157, 158, 159 and 160, relating to investigation of raw material resources for steel production: Appropriates \$2,000,000, instead of \$149,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 162 and 163, relating to manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research. Appropriates \$900,000 as proposed by the House, for manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research, instead of \$1,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$20,000 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 174. Corrects total.

#### AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Nos. 113 and 119, relating to the appropriation for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, and correcting the total of general fund appropriations.

No. 156, relating to pilot plant construction and operation in connection with raw material resources for steel production.

JED JOHNSON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
W. F. NORRELL,  
ALBERT E. CARTER,  
ROBERT F. JONES,  
BEN F. JENSEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, what was agreed upon with reference to amendment No. 120, entitled "Water conservation and utility projects"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the gentleman knows, the Senate placed in the bill an item of \$4,000,000 for that purpose, without Budget estimates. As the bill passed the House it carried no funds for that purpose. I am glad to report that there is a carry-over of an unexpended balance of \$4,936,000 in that fund. The conferees agreed to add \$64,000 to make the total of \$5,000,000 available for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the balance is reappropriated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is continued available without reappropriation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And if priorities may be secured for the necessary critical materials, these small projects under the Wheeler-Case Act may be completed with that \$5,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is my understanding, and there is legislation pending that will make these projects financially feasible.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On the Bonneville proposition, amendment numbered 15—that was agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Three million and seventy thousand dollars was agreed on, but I assume the gentleman is referring to the \$87,000 which was in controversy. We allowed \$70,000 which seems to be agreeable.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. As I understand, the conferees have agreed to restore \$70,000 of the amount that was eliminated, which was recommended by the Budget, for the Bonneville item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Oregon that he made such a good statement on the floor the other day that we yielded to his judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I would like to ask the chairman of the conference committee what is the chairman's understanding of the action of the conferees with regard to the item for the operation of the manganese beneficiation plant covered under amendments 162 and 163?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the gentleman knows, the bill as it passed the House carried an item of \$900,000 for the operation of pilot plants which, as I recall, are in that general area. The Senate added \$1,000,000. Nine hundred thousand dollars of that was for the Chamberlain, S. Dak., plant. The Senate yielded on that part of it.

Mr. CASE. But the gentleman's first statement was that the \$900,000 was for the operation of the manganese plant in that area. I assume he referred to the South Dakota area which he mentioned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well I am sure the great State of South Dakota is in that general area but, of course, I am not in a position to advise the Bureau of Mines how or where to use these funds.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. On amendment No. 122 provision for appropriation of \$1,900,000 to build a power line from Shasta Dam down to Oroville, Calif.—what was done with that amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman refers to amendment 110. The Senate yielded on that. I have not examined the record, but the information I have is that that particular amendment was placed in another bill that will be forthcoming tomorrow, the deficiency bill, which will be considered tomorrow. Of course, that does not mean that the House conferees have agreed to it or that there is any gentlemen's understanding about it. The Senate conferees just lifted it out and put it in the deficiency bill.

Mr. RANKIN. It means that the amendment has not been finally disposed of?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; it is not in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not the only amendment that has been defeated by the House and put in another bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are there certain projects that were taken care of by continuing or reappropriation provisions? How about the Gila project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The members found that there was a carry-over, an unexpended balance, for instance, like the important Gila project, in which the gentleman is vitally interested. There is \$1,875,000 carry-over that will be made available until it is expended. I repeat that it is a very important project, in which the gentleman's State is vitally concerned.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Referring to amendment No. 120—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman refers to water conservation and utility projects. There is \$5,000,000 now available for that purpose, when this bill becomes law.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the language in this bill make it available?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is not necessary, because it is available until expended.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. This is an important matter, as far as the Osage Nation in my district is concerned. I would like to get

the mystery of amendment No. 84 on page 53 straightened out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know of no particular mystery about it.

Mr. DISNEY. Perhaps I was unfortunate in my choice of words. The Senate amendment came back here with certain features involved, and then the conferees changed it without any question being raised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman referring to the Osage attorney squabble?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; that is what I wanted to get straightened out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Which side of that controversy does the gentleman wish to take?

Mr. DISNEY. That is not the question. These Indians have their own money and we appropriate it. They want to select their own tribal attorney and they want to pay for it, but the Department has a happy way of making him Assistant Solicitor General, letting the Solicitor General's office pay him, and then taking the money of the Osages and reimbursing the Solicitor General's department, the Department selecting the attorney. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. The Senate amendment that appears in the bill provides that the tribal attorney shall be hired by the tribe. They want to hire him, and that the Indian agent may be hired by the Department. Then I understand the conferees completely reversed that and the conference report provides for the hiring of the agent by the tribe and the attorney by the Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is also correct.

Mr. DISNEY. I want to know, if you care to say for the RECORD, why it was changed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Obviously, it was changed upon the suggestion of the Senate conferees. That being a matter about which I have no information, except letters and telegrams from both factions. Frankly, I do not know what a majority of the Indians want. If the gentleman does, and desires to advise the House at this time, I should be glad to give him the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DISNEY. This was changed by the Senate conferees voluntarily, without any action by the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I will say to my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, like every other item considered in the conference, it met with the approval of both House and Senate conferees. The gentleman understands that this matter was all in the conference report that was adopted by the House several days ago.

Mr. DISNEY. But I understand that it was originally in the bill the way the Indians wanted the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now the gentleman seems to be taking sides. I am sure I do not know what a majority of those Indians really want. It is true that the amendment in question was placed in the bill by the Senate subcommittee which, of course, they have a perfect right to do.



Mr. DISNEY. And it went back and then the Senate conferees proceeded to reverse the thing and change it?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. While it is true that the transmission line from the Shasta power plant and the Shasta substation to Oroville was taken out by the conferees, still there were funds left in this bill for a transmission line extending from the Shasta Dam and the Shasta powerhouse to the Shasta substation in the amount of \$400,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. But it was the transmission line to Oroville that was taken out by the House and Senate conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I do not know whether I understood the amount correctly to which reference has been made, but to the Tucumcari project has been added \$500,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman from New Mexico that the Tucumcari project has been very generously dealt with, so far as the House conferees are concerned. As the gentleman will recall, there was no budget estimate for this project, which is a very splendid project, one which I understand is about 90 percent finished; it will require little, if any, critical materials to finish it, and for that reason the House felt that it could add \$500,000, even though there is no Budget estimate.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is in addition to the carry-over?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is in addition to the carry-over of \$656,000, making a total of \$1,156,000.

Mr. CARTER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and also the very active and valuable interest of our colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 113: Page 72, line 18, "Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, \$1,985,000; Provided, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed \$3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 113, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, \$1,650,000: Provided, That of the total construction costs of all features of the project not to exceed \$3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the reclamation law."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In the event this amount is insufficient, can the gentleman's committee give consideration to the necessity later on of having a deficiency in order to complete this worthwhile project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I might say to the gentleman, my colleague from Oklahoma, in whose district the project is located, who is vitally concerned, that of course the committee knows this is insufficient to finish the project and it is considerably under the Senate figure. The gentleman may recall that in a colloquy with him on the floor a few days ago I advised him I was trying to keep all items within Budget estimates. I also made it plain that I would not ask for a dollar over the estimates for an Oklahoma project if we could hold all the others down to Budget figures. But that was not done in every instance. There are a few exceptions and I am glad to tell him that Lugert-Altus is one of those exceptions. I cannot, of course, give any assurance as to what this committee will do in the future, but I can assure the gentleman that the committee will give the Lugert-Altus project a square deal in the future as it has in the past.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I want to thank the gentleman for adding the \$150,000 above the Budget estimate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 119: Page 73, line 13, strike out "\$12,100,000" and insert "\$43,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$32,809,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 156: Page 86, line 11, after the word "including," insert "private plant construction, and operation to utilize more fully sound resources and."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the various votes by which the amendments were disposed of was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we come now to the final passage of this bill. The vote we have just taken rings down the curtain on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned. As I indicated a few minutes ago, there was a complete agreement between Senate and House conferees for the first time during the long, tedious meetings of the conferees. Members of this House will recall that your House subcommittee, after some 5 or 6 weeks of daily hearings, reported a bill to the House nearly \$10,000,000 below the Budget estimates. As has happened many times in the past between economy speeches at the other end of the Capitol, that great body added approximately \$55,000,000 to the bill, more than \$20,000,000 of which was without Budget estimates. It is no secret, but a matter of record, that heretofore, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, in most instances House conferees have talked in vain in an effort to bring the bill back to you within or below Budget estimates. When your House conferees announced that we expected to bring this bill here for final passage below the Budget, there were those who smiled and said it just could not be done. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am glad to report to you that this bill as finally passed by this House is approximately \$2,600,000 below Budget estimates.

In making this announcement I desire to give full credit to a loyal subcommittee that has stood by me and worked harmoniously and unselfishly in an effort to accomplish what seemed to be the impossible. I also desire to thank the membership of this House for standing by this committee on every vote despite the pressure groups who endeavored to load the bill down with millions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. COOLEY. I desire to compliment the gentleman and would like to ask him what provision was made with regard to the steel investigation. Is my understanding correct that the conferees agreed to \$2,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; the gentleman will recall that when he and others raised the question about this item that we assured him that we would compromise on a reasonable figure. That was one of the few items in the bill on which the conferees were willing to go far in excess of the Budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the conferees were justified in doing that, and I congratulate them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the members of the committee as well as the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle for the support they gave their conferees. You stood shoulder to shoulder with us in our fight for the taxpayers of the Nation. The showing made by the committee demonstrates what cooperation, teamwork, and the elimination of

partisan considerations in legislation can accomplish.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the results that the chairman of the committee says have been accomplished were accomplished, and it was due largely to his leadership. In conference with the Senate the usual procedure is for the House conferees to surrender, but under the leadership of the gentleman from Oklahoma the House conferees stood up this time and were able to bring in a very splendid report. I say again it is due largely to his splendid efforts.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 275. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 413. An act to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 636. An act to amend the Act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 753. An act to repeal subsection (c) of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to authorize a uniform allowance for certain graduates of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1076. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 1101. An act to provide for payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1156. An act to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bleckert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Habersfeld;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1134. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 6, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARING

##### COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, July 6, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

546. A letter from the executive officer, Petroleum Administration for War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Petroleum Administration for War for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, submitted in accordance with Budget Circular No. 421; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

547. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

548. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, National Resources Planning Board, transmitting a copy of the estimates of personnel requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year for the National Resources Planning Board on the form provided by the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

549. A letter from the secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending September 23, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

550. A letter from the administrative officer, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, War Manpower Commission, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

551. A letter from the Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting information concerning their personnel for the ensuing quarter, as required by Circular No. 421 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

552. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.



553. A letter from the administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget covering the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the National Gallery of Art for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

554. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds," as provided in Independent Offices Appropriation Act, approved June 26, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2886. A bill to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 666. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 667. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3128. A bill to make it unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States or is or has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 3129. A bill to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3130. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3131. A bill to authorize the issuance of lapel buttons to persons who serve in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3132. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfork

Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 3133. A bill to permit certain capital expenditures on farms to be deducted in computing net income for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3134. A bill exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3135. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution providing for disposition of equipment and facilities of National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the passage of legislation, notwithstanding a presidential veto, by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected or within 2 years after the expiration of such time, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War II, and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 290. Resolution to provide for the expenses of continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 119, a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the National Council of the Republic of Poland, expressing their deep appreciation of the help that the United States of America has given to the Polish Republic on this day, July 4, 1943; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Henry Grossi; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1902. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Resolution of the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring herein), That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American Government, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights, at least until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been brought home, demobilized, and given an opportunity to express their views; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1903. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. M. A. Bradford and 39 others attending the Baptist county convention at Bangor, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1904. Also, petition of Margaret Ulrich and 40 delegates in attendance at the Indiana Synod of the Presbyterian Church, June 14-17, 1943, Third Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1905. Also, petition of Cora A. West, and 40 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1906. Also, petition of George Underwood and 64 citizens of Glenwood, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1907. Also, petition of Emma Potter and 51 citizens of Dansville, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1908. Also, petition of Herman Bratten and 20 citizens of Brady, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1909. Also, petition of Myrtle Camp and 40 citizens of Watervliet, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the

winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1910. Also, petition of Virginia Pike and 24 citizens of Ione, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1911. Also, petition of Alice May Stuart and 85 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1912. Also, petition of Jennie Jones and 52 citizens of Wenatchee, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1913. Also, petition of Mary C. Woodworth and 60 citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1914. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Jacobson and 64 citizens of Aitkin, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. Also, petition of Mrs. Bert Smith and 55 citizens of Holland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1916. Also, petition of G. S. Summers and 25 citizens of Grafton, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1917. Also, petition of Mrs. Winston D. Goss and 20 citizens of Church Point, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1918. Also, petition of Mrs. J. O. Engle and 23 members of the Loyal Women's Class of the Christian Sunday School, of Burlington, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve

manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1919. Also, petition of Grace M. Hamilton and 177 citizens of Wilton, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1920. Also, petition of Elma H. Green and 67 citizens of Westfield, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1921. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Jennie Knapp, of Poughkeepsie, and 82 other residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, stating that they believe by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, and rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1922. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Henry Shadowens, Leone B. Kendall, Mildred Hawes, Ida Ensley, John H. Burkham, and sundry other residents of Dayton, Ohio, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1923. Also, petition of Hotel Gibbons, Dutcher's Grill, College Inn Restaurant, McShane's Restaurant, John Stanko, R. P. Sleight, R. H. Remick, Harry W. Lantz, E. R. Chadwell, Holden Hotel Co., Ed Noll, and sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1924. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. O. V. Collins and 52 residents of Goff, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1925. Also, petition of C. E. White, grocer, and 60 other businessmen of Sabetha, Kans., soliciting and making application to the Appropriations Committee for some definite and decisive action to curtail the recent arbitrary and dictatorial orders of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1926. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of George M. Anderson, of Clay City, Ind., and 78 other signers from that community, urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1927. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Resolution of the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of West Virginia, in convention assembled, expressing opposition to legislation to provide for additional social security insofar as it will involve the payment of pensions to servicemen and retirement pay to men in

the Regular services, urging that all veterans' legislation be handled separately from civilian legislation and that all veterans' affairs continue to be administered by Veterans' Administration, and opposing all proposals of a similar nature to consolidate veterans pensions, disability, retirement, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation benefits with civilian benefits as administered under social security laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1928. Also, resolution of approximately 35 citizens of the city of Richwood, W. Va., assembled in the First Methodist Church of said city, as drafted by the Reverend W. Malcolm Fuller and presented by the Reverend E. U. Wills, favoring enactment of House bill 2082, prohibiting for the duration of the war the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all liquors, and urging their Representative to use his influence in having said bill reported and enacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1929. Also, petition of Mrs. Morgan Marks and 19 other residents of Richwood, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1930. Also, petition of Mrs. A. E. Haggerty and 17 other residents of Richwood, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1931. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the County Treasurers' Association of California, regarding Japanese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1932. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Administrator of National Housing Agency to grant priorities for additional conversion units for San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1933. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1934. Also, petition of the League of Democratic Women of San Diego County, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Smith-Connally antistrike bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1935. Also, petition of the Petroleum Engineers' Club of Dallas, opposing the enactment of Senate bills 607 and 793, with reference to the petroleum industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid all the voices of this vast and varied world save us from the supreme tragedy of missing Thy call.